QUAKERISM CANVASSED:

Robin Barclay baffled in the defending of his Theſes againſt young Students at *Aberdene*, and he, together with *Mr. George Keith* and the reſt of his friends, found guilty of blaſphemy, treaſon, lying, ſhifting, quibling, tergiverſing, *&c.*

OR,

A moſt true and faithful accompt of a Diſpute betwixt ſome Students of Divinity at *Aberdene*, and the Quakers in and about the place, holden in *Alexander Harper* his Cloſs (or Yard) *April* 14. 1675. years, before ſome hundreds of witneſſes, *Andrew Thomſon* being Preſes; Together with the Quakers pretended true and faithful accompt of the ſame Diſpute examined.

As alſo,

A further Confutation of the Quakers Principles, by the former Arguments more fully amplified, and diverſe other demonſtrations, *&c.*

Publiſhed by { *Al. Shirreff.* *John Leſlie.* *Paul Gellie.* } M. A.

Prov. 18. 17. *He that is firſt in his own cauſe ſeemeth juſt, but his neighbour cometh and ſearcheth him.*

2 Cor. 11. 14, 15. —*Satan himſelf is transformed into an Angel of light.* v. 15. *Therefore it is no great thing if his Miniſters alſo be transformed as the Miniſters of righteouſneſs*, &c.

Rev. 20. 7. *And when the thouſand years ſhall be expired, Satan ſhall be looſed out of his priſon.* v. 8. *And ſhall go out and deceive the nations.*

Hilarius in 109. Pſal. p. 621. *Horum* (*Hæreticorum ſciz.*) *labia ſunt iniqua, doloſæ autem linguæ, opus fallax eſt; Hæreticorum quoque iſta mendacia ſunt*, &c.

Printed in the Year, 1675.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND
B
11 MR
1957

TO

The Right Noble and Potent Lord,

KENNETH

L. MACKENZIE & KENTAIL, &c.

May it please your Lordship,

THe *diſingenuity and petulancy of our Adverſaries, in miſrepreſenting what hath paſt betwixt them and us, in a publick debate, ſeveral Moneths ago, hath oblidged us to publiſh a full and true accompt of that matter, and to add ſome things more for the further confutation of theſe errours we were then Impugning, and the repelling of theſe ſlanders and reproaches, wherewith their book was ſtuffed. And now we make bold to preſent this little work to your Lordſhip, not that we deſire you ſhould patroniſe any weakneſs or eſcapes in it, nor yet that we expect your Lordſhips name ſhould ſhelter us from Calumny and reproach, eſpecially from ſuch Adverſaries, who value themſelves for ſpeaking evil of dignities, and denying even thoſe common teſtimonies of reſpect, which the Laws both of God and man hath entailed upon thoſe of your Lordſhips quality and rank; But in a complyance with the general and innocent cuſtome, which hath long obtained that few books come abroad, but have the name of ſome e-*

minent

minent and worthy person prefixed unto them, we thought fit to lay this small treatise at your Lordships feet, that we may take this opportunity to testifie to the world that honour and esteem, which we have for your Lordship, not only upon the accompt of your illustrious birth, but more especially for those blooming and early vertues, which have already attracted the eyes and hearts of all, who have the honour to know you. Were we not afraid to do violence to your Lordships modesty, it might be fit to propose you, as an example, to those of your quality and age, by representing the candor and ingenuity, the sweetness and affability, the sobriety and manly gravity of your Lordships temper: but, because in a time wherein true vertue is so rare, the justest praises are obnoxious to suspicion, and they who do best deserve them, are always least desirous of them, we shall not inlarge in a subject which will be troublesome to your Lordship, who doubtless finds more satisfaction in the native sweetnesse of those vertues, then in the resound and Echo of them. And now hoping your Lordship will pardon the boldness of our address, and accept of this little token of our great respect, we shall only add our prayers, that God who hath blessed your Noble Family with such an hopeful Heir, may preserve and prosper you, and may continue to bless you with those endowments, whereby you may in time become a Patron to the Church, a Promoter of the Truth, a Honour to your Country, and a Blessing to your Generation; So we subscribe our selves,

Your Lordships

Most humble and most

obliged Servants,

A. S. J. L. P. G.

The

The Preface.

To the reader, wherein the occasion of this dispute and the reasons of Printing it, together also with somethings that serve to justifie our narration & discredit our Adversaries are set down, and their Preface and contra-remonstrance are answered, &c.

CHristian Reader, we should have been exceeding loath to have troubled the world so early, with such an unpolished treatile, if there had not been an inevitable necessity laid upon us, by our shameless and restless adversaries, the Quakers; who have lately given an luculent demonstration of their impudence, by publishing a forged and false accompt of our late Dispute with them at *Aberdene*: Wherein they have egregiously wronged us, by their wonderfully, grosse misrepresentations, and not only so (for that had not been a sufficient argument to have induced us to expose our selves so soon to the publick view of a critical world, joyned with the undoubted assault of deceitful and scribling adversaries) but also have done what they could to raise an evil report upon the truth of God, and stumble the weak. Upon these and the like considerations we judged our selves bound in conscience to appear thus in print, and vindicat both the truth and our selves from their *Calumnies* and false imputations; and to shew the disingenuity and some other of the more haynous crimes of this lofty people, who although they pretend to uprightnesse & Christianity beyond all others, yet, indeed they come fare short of common honesty. But, that we may proceed, the more happily and easily, in this work we judge it not either impertinent or unreasonable to give you, in this preliminary discourse, a true and ingenuous accompt both of our undertaking the Dispute, and also of our early appearing in Print.

Some moneths ago, some of us who were Students of Divinity, did occasionally go to their meeting house, intending to have been meer spectators; and heard one D. R. impugne some Theses published more arrogantly then judiciously in name of these deluded creatures (as they give it out) by R. B. and denominated sound and solide Divinity; whereas they are utterly destitute, if not wholly repugnant, both to soundnes and solidity, being (for the most part) unreasonable and ungodly positions of Phanatical and deceitful Sophists cunningly disguised with the pretext of Scripture, that thereby the event might the better answer and correspond to their damnable end of subverting the simple, and constituting to themselves Proselites in their pernicious errours. We were indeed frustrated of this our intention, this person (who as we were informed, came to town of purpose to dispute their theses with them) being most uncivilly keeped at the door by them: But we having gotten entry before the door was shut, heard most patiently & modestly (which they them-

selves

ſelves dare not deny) all their tautologiſing diſcourſes, indefinite repititions and odious revilings, notwithſtanding that ſome of themſelves in the mean time, that another of them was preaching, or as they call it declaring, came and provoked us to Diſpute their Theſes now, if we durſt, and be as crouſe as we were the other day on the Streets: Theſe were their words, and had a reference to a former debate between them and us: after which alſo they had deſired us before many witneſſes, if we durſt to anſwer the publick provocation, which was given us in their Printed Theſes. All theſe offers of diſpute we ſhifted, as we had done many more before, and they therefore inſulted mightily over us, by expreſsions, which vve are aſhamed to relate.

When they had ended their diſcourſes, and were beginning to pray (which is not their ordinary cuſtome, for we ſee them uſually meet and ſeparate without prayer) we withdrew towards the door, being reſolved to leave them: & while ſome of themſelves in the very time of their publick prayers (or rather boaſtings) were taking off the lock, which was abuſed by boys without, we were telling privatly amongſt our ſelves how they had miſ-ſtated ſeveral controverſies; which they overhearing dared us again and again, to challenge the preachers themſelves, and make good our aſſertions preſently, adding, when we had denyed, that we were *Currs, cowards, backbiters, ſlanderers*, &c. We being ſo provoked & reproached by them (ſeverals alſo of our own Church there preſent ſolliciting us importunatly) did reaſon a little about ſeveral things delivered in their diſcourſes; In doing whereof, we ſo preſſed them that their only anſwer and evaſion was (which ſince that, we have found to be one of their chief refuges) paſſionate railing, calling us barking dogs, unreaſonable beaſts, &c. eſpecially G. K. vvhich he dare not deny.

The door at laſt being oppened, D. R. obtained entry, and being come in, offered to impugne their theſes; which they refuſed, alledging him not to be ſober; and provoked us to do it; oblidging themſelves to anſwer us. We fearing to ingage with them publickly, and perceiving what meaſure of learning the very beſt Scholars among them had, fearing alſo leſt our continual declining of their provocations, eſpecially of this publick one ſhould be imputed, not only to our ignorance (which had been but little matter) but alſo to the weakneſs of our cauſe, and be improven by our vigilant enemies for the ſtumbling and ſeducing honeſt & well-meaning Chriſtians, and being likewiſe preſſed thereto, by men of our own perſuaſion, there preſent, accepted their challenge at laſt, and offered to impugne their Theſes either preſently, or in the after-noon. Then they perceiving their vain boaſtings and windy provocations to come ſhort of their chief deſigne (which was to out-boaſt us and not to diſpute with us, as may be judged by what follows) fell themſelves into the ſame ditch, which they had prepared for us and refiled ſhamefully from their provocations, alledging that they were not bound to diſpute with us, unleſſe we would purchaſe the publick places to diſpute in, which they had required as a condition of the diſpute in their theſes, meerly, that they might get way for their boaſtings; knowing certainly, that theſe neither would nor ought to be granted them. Upon this we acknowledge our ſelves, to have urged them boldly to ſtand to their inſolent provocations; and having made known to all preſent

their

their shifts subterfuges, and unreasonableness, &c. were leaving them: But they finding themselves affronted publickly, promised to meet with us towards the evening, & draw up conditions of a dispute to be appoynted then, unto which we acquiesced and conveened accordingly.

In this meeting, they indeed outreached us in drawing up the Articles; and the reason was not so much, because we did not see their lying in wait, as because they would not let us draw back without the calumny of tergiversing and shifting the dispute, and yet they would not dispute themselves without these conditions. So being straitned between two extreams, we took a day to advise, and, having come back at the time appointed, desired that several things might be helped, for example, that it might be said in the 1 *Art.* (*a pretended publick challenge*, or *a challenge which the Quakers say is given to the preachers*) and we gave this reason, that we saw no ground in the Theses, for saying that any challenge was given to the ministers more then to others, for others could dispute with them in these publick places no less then ministers. This they refused thinking to be rid of us and leave us again under the calumny of shifting the debate: Wherefore we subscribed the Articles, having first told them that we took and would explain the Articles in these senses. But it is exceeding strange that they notwithstanding that we condescended to their implacable humor almost in every Article, yet, they did break the most if not all of them both in word and write: to instance in one and omite the rest, which we could evidence also, if we designed not brevity, they agreed with us in the Articles, that it should be only an private dispute, and yet they, expecting a signal victory as it seems, erected two publick stages without our knowledge and invited the most of *Aberdene* to it, by which they made it a publick Disput, yea, and printed it, by which they made it yet more publick. Which if we had foreknown, we would never upon so short advertisement in such an unseasonable time have undertaken the Dispute; not being then so well acquainted with their principles and subterfuges, as might have been desired for such a work; For the time that interveened betwixt our subscribing of the Articles, and the Dispute it self, was but six dayes, whereof one was a day of fast, another a preparation day for the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, a third the Lords day wherein it was celebrated, and we all who were Disputants, did communicate, a fourth, an thanksgiving day, so that there remained only two dayes, wherein we might think upon the work, and of these two we were necessitated to spend a considerable part otherwise. All which duely weighed in the scales of ingenuity, we hope, may be an sufficient apologie, for any inconsiderate expressions, that may have escaped us in the Dispute: Which began at two a-clock in the afternoon, and lasted till half to six; longer then was appointed, but not so long as we (in whose option it was to lengthen it) had designed, for our arguments were not well begun when the Quakers put an end to the same with their railings and new provocations. Who were really victors, they or we, we will not affirm, but leave to be judged, by others; But this we may say, in the opinion of most, if not all the hearers, the Quakers lost the day, R. B. lost his credit and the report of their losse past through city and country; & many inclining to Quakerism were established, yea, some

of the Q: seemed to be troubled in their minds; for one of them said to some of us, that both their Disputants and We had come short in the matter of the seed, and that there was none but would come short in the same, it is so nigh to God and so far from us, &c, another blamed G. K. for his distinguishing between permissive and mandative inspirations, between positive and negative permissions, &c. and most of them said, that we had done as well as any could have done; having gotten (as they falsely alledged) arguments from our masters, &c.

But behold a new stratagem, our Adversaries without our knowledge or consent, emitted in print a counterfeit narration of the Dispute backed with a bundle of lies and new provocations to regain their credit & reputation, to keep their Proselits in their errours, to raise an evil report upon us, and the truth of God, and to stumble the weak by a lye; because they got not the same accomplished by real deed; being led with such a desire of vain glory, that they are ashamed neither of vanity, nor deceit, if so be they might be thought to have overcome; very unlike to *Alexander* the great, who said *nolo furari victoriam*. Wherefore we resolved to publish a full and faithful narration of the Dispute, some brief reflections on their false accompt, appendices and postscripts, Together with some other things, which may serve for the further confutation of their principles and discovering to the world the bad tendency of the same; Which we made known in a printed *remonstrance*: But our Adversaries perceiving it to leave a blot upon them, went about to demonstrate (as they said) the impudency of it in print, by a *demonstration* indeed so ridiculous, that we esteemed unworthy of an answer (viz. *We Quakers do faithfully declare that we deale honestly*, &c. a very friendly testimony forsooth.

We, being so constrained and ingaged, have now published this Treatise, wherein we have given you a faithful accompt of the Dispute sufficiently attested, we may say, the same individual words and expressions, so far as possible: But we mean chiefly of the subject and matter of it; and meabed so in our remonstrance, although these quibling Quakers turned it over to words in their *contra remonstrance*, that they might take occasion to rail: and all along with our own accompt, we have in a second columne given you some brief reflections on their accompt. After these, we have in a second part set down a further confutation of their Principles both by the former arguments more fully amplified, and also by diverse other demonstrations; and closed up all with some reflections of their reviling, and new offers of Dispute. Thus have we acquainted you with the occasion and result of the dispute, as also the subject and matter of this treatise.

But here it will not be amisse to speak to some other things, which may serve to justifie our relation and discredit our Adversaries.

First of all then, we had three or four writers; some whereof wrot with short hand, some with swift hand to us in time of Dispute: But they pretend only to one who was thronged in among them on the stage; and wrot so, that some of our Adversaries confessed to us, that they made little or no use of his papers, in drawing up their accompt; and we doubt if they had any writ-

ter at all. 2. We doubt if our Adversaries have gotten so much as the verbal testimony, of any that were present the whole time, much less a subscription we know of none, and if they get any, he must be a Jesuite or of that opinion, who will not spare to give an implicite subscription, and do any thing *pro libito*, which may indamnage the truth and make divisions in our Churches. They have indeed three or four *Quakers* subscriptions: But these were parties concerned, who subscribed the Articles, some of whom, have given implicite subscriptions; especially A. H. who being questioned by us about the same, caused afterwards for fear of censure, put his name to it as publisher only; and cancel it as a Testatour. But *ex altera parte*, we had the general applause, as said is, and many who were neither concerned, nor of our opinion, after the perusal of our Narration, confest that it was truely faithful and ingenuous. We might have quadrupled the number of the subscriptions of *Q.* that were Disputants, & has subscribed their Account, with the number of subscriptions of Students, that were not Disputants. And likewise we have the truth of this Narration sufficiently attested, by credible Witnesses, who, while it was yet fresh in their memories, and before our Adversaries account was seen; were pleased, after serious perusal of the same, to put their subscriptions to it. The *Q.* indeed have railed upon them in their *contra-remonstrance*, before they knew who they are, and thereby declare that they have not tender Consciences, but speakes at random, as their interest leads them; and therefore ought not to be believed or regarded, though they speak against their afterwards, when they know them. But suppose that the *Q.* knew them, we deny that they are ignorant or prejudicate and malicious, though they be of a contrary perswasion: for they were not Disputants or Parties, neither appeared we as publick Persons.

3. Our Adversaries have grosly erred in their account, and lied, as we have proved; by our reflections on the same, by very probable Arguments, if not Demonstrations, deduced from the Matter, coherence, and circumstances of the Debate; And as all the Auditors also, who have seen their Narration, will know after the reading of this, which will bring several things to their remembrance, that are not so much as touched in their account, and will prove sufficiently whatsoever we asserted in our *Remonstrance*: yea, and the *Q.* themselves have confest it to be erroneous; we instance, R: B. 1. C. who being challenged for omitting this Argument (*What was instituted by Christ and never repealed, is still binding: but Baptism with water was so*, &c.) acknowledged it to be omitted; and thereupon they, with the rest of their friends concealed their printed account a long time from us; and often in the interval, begged of us, that we would let them see our Narration, and promised, if we would meet with them and publish a new Narration, which both parties should subscribe, and call (*a more correct and enlarged account*, &c.) to be at the half, if not all the expences of Printing: but however, they have been beyond all doubt conscious of their manifold escapes in the former, and thinking by that offer to allure us, being but young Men, and in their opinion unable to pay for Printing our own Narration. This their opinion they signified to us more then once, and as we rationally suppose, they have upon this account taken liberty to belie us, expecting never to be censured by us for the

same.

same: In the mean time you may mark here an horrible Crime, in *I. C.* who, notwithstanding of these his confessions and offers, hath subscribed their *contra-remonstrance*, and therein protested in the sight of God, that they were innocent and faithful, &c. And you may also be perswaded, that the *Q.* will not fail to appear for their Idols *quovis modo*. As for us, we appeal the *Q.* we appeal all the Auditors whatsomever, if we have concealed our own infirmities, or the strength of our Antagonists Answers, as the *Q.* have done, we provoke them to challenge and evidence any material escape whatsomever, if they can.

In the next place, we shall examine the things that may serve for excusing their faults, and discrediting our Account. First of all, then, they bring an apology for the Printing of their Account, that we threatned to Print, and boasted of an Victory, *pag.* 3. Answ. They wrest our words basely; we intended to hinder them from their usual custom of spreading false reports, and said only conditionally, that they needed not think to misrepresent us, for we had the whole Dispute well written, and might put it to the Press before that day eight dayes, if we pleased; and as for our boasting of Victory, if we had done any thing of that nature, we had sufficient ground for it, as many others besides us do conceive; and were the more justifiable, that our Adversaries without shame or honesty abused us both in City and Countrey, and commended themselves largely. But, that the general report of our Victory was occasioned, by our alledged boasting, we altogether deny, for, before ever we came down from the Stage, the generality of people being fully perswaded of the strength of our Arguments, and convinced of the weakness and unreasonableness of their Answers, had given us their unanimous approbation, and before that we separated, had begun to spread the rumour, so that in every place we found it before us, and brought it not with us.

2. To apologise for the faults of their account, they assert (*p.* 3. and 4. of their pamphlet, and also in their contra-remonstrance) that is true according to their memories which they have confessed to be bad, *p.* 67. 68. Ans. How then durst they adventure upon so weak memories, not only so groundlessly to boast as they do in their pamphlet, to intitulate it (*a true and faithful account*) and confidently assert the things contained in it, without any restriction or limitation, but also impudently to perswade themselves, that all the impartial Auditors would affirm their account to be true, notwithstanding that they know we had gotten the Testimony and Approbation of some, if not all such hearers? However, we are jealous that they have prevaricated of set purpose and industry; for they have omitted things that are very notour, as can be shewed from the matter and circumstances of the Dispute, and they have inserted nothing wherein they failed.

3. They alledge that two or three of us spake often at once, and some other that were not concerned (*p.* 3. and 4.) and hindred them from catching some things that were extrinsick from the matter. Ans. Might not the same reasons hinder them from remembring Arguments, and might not we make a shrewd Retortion here upon themselves? For very often, they not only interrupted us, and were threatned to be debarred therefore, from further speaking according to the Articles; but also *G. K.* interrupted, sloped, and contradi-

tradicted R. B. when he was bewraying ignorance; and R. B. obtruded himself upon G. K. and Al. Sk. not being a subscriber nor a preses, did most impertinently interrupt both his friends and us, and intrude himself, especially after that the Preses had left us. But as to the things alledged upon us, they speak very often two or three of them at once; but especially towards the end of the Dispute, when the Preses had removed, and gave in different answers. so that we were forced to reply *singuli singulis*, or else to let them roave at random. This they have confirmed, by setting down ordinarily two or three speeches of G. K. and R. B. together one immediatly after another. These cases excepted, we utterly deny, that two or three of us should speak together, though perhaps, one of us have spoken immediatly after another. Al. *Brown* also (called by them *p.* 4. out of disdain one *Brown*, whereas they know his name, or might in point of civility asked it from us, who were daily conversing with them) before the Dispute began, offered himself to Dispute, because he was challenged, and having refused to subscribe the Articles, as not being allowable in his opinion, was therefore asperst by them as a tergiverser: but that he or any unconcerned, intruded himself into the Dispute, we utterly deny as a notorious falshood.

4. To diminish the credit of our insuing Relation, they will yet doubtless, add this Cavil to the rest, that our Preses has not subscribed it. Ans. they cannot deny that he gave us an ample Approbation and Verbal Testimony of Victory; and told roundly, that the Q. had no other way of evasion from the Students Arguments, but their carping at words, not only to us, but also to many eminent and judicious persons in both Cities. But as to his subscription, he denyed it not, because he doubted of our fidelity and ingenuity in the matter; for he never read our account to know, whether it was true or false, and consequently had other reasons of denying his subscription.

5. We will be blamed for putting in all the reflections, impertinencies, quiblings, shifts, digressions &c. into the body of our Narration; and so making it unpleasant to the Reader, whereas we might have set them down by themselves, before or after it, as the Q. have done. Ans. We did set them down in their own places, wherein they were spoken, studying faithfulnels & had our Narration subscribed by our Witnesses, before that we had seen their Account, and so could not change them, least any should seek a fight of our Subscribed Written Account, and by comparing it with the Printed Account, find us faulty: For which cause, we have the Subscribed Copy besides us, and are clear to let any man see it and compare it with the Printed Copy; Yea, though we had not this impediment, we would not change these things; for then we should not shew all our Adversaries shiftings, quiblings, &c. and so should not be faithful, more then our Adversaries; who have not cared to be unfaithful in misplacing them for the concealing their own shame and disgrace. We had almost forgotten to speak concerning our stile, at which doubtless some will be quarrelling; for what can please all men of so many different and contrary fancies and humors? As to it then, we have in the account it self kept, as said is, the words that were spoken by both parties upon the Stage, as far as possible, and have put the rest in a dresse of language, so familiar and plain, as may sufficiently evince, that our designe was to Write

against

against them, not as Students of Oratry, Rhetorick or moral Philosophy: but as those who imploy themselves in the constant study of Divinity. It is indeed very like, that all the parts of these scheduls will not be found to have a like lustre and splendor; neither is it any wonder, if they reflect their beames unequally, seing they have proceeded some from one hand, some from another, and some of them from us all three togethers, who yet within fewy years may all say of our selves, as *Paul* sayeth of himself 2 Cor. 13. 11. ὅτι ἤμην νήπιος, ὡς νήπιος ἐλάλουν. But if any speak of sharpnesse used against our Adversaries, we conceive, we have abstained from all personal Criminations; notwithstanding that they had stuffed their Pamphlet with such: and so, albeit we could likewaies have easely loaded them with twice as many well grounded accusations, as they have been pleased to asperse, both us and our Ministers with false lies and calumnies, yet we have not rendred evil for evil. And if now and then we have enveighed more sharply against their Tenets, and give them a denomination *pro rerum* (as for example, we have called them infolent intruders, because they usurp the Ministerial Office without a sufficient Call, we call them sacrilegious, because they deny due Stipends and Livelihood to Ministers &c.) let it be marked, that we do not so much thrust at them, as at their impious Doctrines, which we intended to disgrace.

These things we judged fit to premise, and would not omit, even the most trivial of them, knowing certainly that this generation of Enthusiasts will be ready to carp at them, when they can find no other way of supporting their untruths and heretical opinions, not that we take the least delight or pleasure in the like matters, or had any desire to put the Reader to the trouble of perusing them; but only to vindicate the Truth and our selves of their false imputations, and to shew their disingenuity and unchristian dealings. But fearing, least this preliminary discourse should swell beyond the bounds of a Preface, we conclude the same with these Reasonable demands, to these our unreasonable Adversaries, that if they will needs publish any thing against this Treatise, they would do it, 1. Modestly and soberly, abstaining from all railings and calumnies. 2. They would answer it as it lies, not omitting any thing of moment, for he that culls out some lesser things from the rest, is like one nibbling at the twigs and outmost branches of a Tree, not stricking at the Root or Principal limbs of it, which is most fit to surrender the Cause, and confess that he cannot answer the whole. And 3. that they do it, not as G. K. writes his Book of immediate Revelation, but perspicuously and clearly, that we may understand their meaning. Which if they really do, we shall judge our selves happy to have encountered with such Adversaries. But, if we find no solid answer to our Books, but only quibling at words, lieing, railings &c. we resolve rather with the learned and judicious, to suffer our scribling Adversaries to enjoy the last word of us, then with the foolish and impertinent to trouble the World in answering things of no moment. And in the mean time we wish from our hearts, that the Lord may recover them that are fallen into this dreadful Heresie of quakerism, establish them that stand, and bless this Work so, as that it may prove an effectual mean for that end.

Sine Maculâ.

A moſt true and faithful Accompt of a Diſpute betwixt the Students of Divinity and Quakers after-named, holden in *Alexander Harpers* Cloſs, at *Aberdine*, *April* 14. 1675. years, before ſome hundreds of witneſſes; *Andrew Thomſon* Advocat being Præſes.

Section I.

Containing the Articles and Preliminary Diſcourſes, &c.

WHen all parties intereſſed were conveened, *Al. Shireff* ſaid, Præſes, I think, Sir, it were expedient now, that we ſhould begin, for the hour is come; and it were good, that firſt of all, theſe Laws and conditions were read: and with that he reached out the Papers to the Moderator, who taking the Papers from him, ſaid, It's a fault that we have not a Clerk. *A. Sh.* You may give it to any indifferent perſon, that he may read it; here is one, who is none of the ſubſcribers, cauſe him read it; whereupon the young man, being deſired, read them. §. 1.

Hereby it is declared that this is to be a private Conference betwixt ſome Students of Divinity, ſo called, and the people called Quakers, as a fulfilling of any challenge wherein theſe Students may be included in, theſe Theſes emitted by *Robin* *Article firſt.*

Barclay (or may have received from any of that people) but abstracting from the publick challenge given to the Preachers in general in the end of the English Theses; because it's offered with this particular condition of having the publick places to dispute in before the auditors, before whom they conceive they have been misrepresented.

Art. 2. It is provided that when any of either party is speaking, if any of their company offer to speak, he that is speaking is to be silent; but if two of a party speak at once, he that is seen to intrude himself, is to be judged impertinent, and excluded from any further access.

Art. 3. That each Speaker on either of the sides have full liberty and time to speak, without interruption of the contrary party; and he that interrupts, shall be debarred from further speaking.

Art. 4. That each side abstain from School terms and distinctions, as much as is possible, but if any use them, that they be opened to the people in English, so that those of ordinary capacity, not being educated at Colledges, may understand them.

Art. 5. As for retortions, they must not be impertinent, and from the purpose; and none of them shall be so insisted on, as to divert us from the point, or turn the opponent into the respondent.

Art. 6. The day appointed for conference, is the fourteenth of *April*, so called, being the day called *Wednesday*, in the year of God, 1675. in *Alexander Harpers* Close, if the *Gray-friers* Church be not obtained, and that from two till five in the afternoon.

Art. 7. Both parties shall endeavour to procure a Præses to moderate, but not to have a decisive Judgement; yet, if such an one cannot be procured, the conference is not to be broken up.

Art. 8. It is hereby declared that both parties intends this for mutual edification, and therefore intends to abstain from any thing that may obstruct so good an issue.

Art. 9. It is likewise agreed, that none shall have liberty to speak, but those that have subscribed, or shall subscribe this paper, before the Dispute begin.

So subscribed the Quakers:

Robert Barclay, *Thomas Mercer*.
George Keith. *John Cowie*.
Robert Burnet. *Alexr. Harper*.
John Skeen. *Thomas Milne*.
Andrew Galloway.

So subscribed the Students,

Mr. *Alexander Shireff*.
Mr. *John Leslie*.
Mr. *Paul Gellie*.
Mr. *David Sibbald*.
Mr. *Alexander Dinnes*.

Immediatly

Immediatly after the reading of these Articles, *J. L.* had a long discourse concerning the wayes of propounding and answering Arguments aright, and concerning the shifting stratagems of Respondents. *G. K.* said, This young man is come to teach us a new course of Logick: *J. L.* It's only that our passage may be the more clear. *A. Sh.* Let us lay aside all these things, and fall to work: Moderator, shall we open this meeting with Prayer. *An. Thomson*, No, they will not joyn with you. *R. Barclay*, Preses, I would crave your patience a little, to inform the people of the occasion of this Dispute; and he spake to this purpose: Seing we Quakers have been very often misrepresented as Hereticks, by the Preachers of the Word in this City, we judge it our duty to shew the world what we believed, and have done so in a Paper lately Printed, wherein we offer our selves to maintain these positions, if we may be allowed these publick places, wherein we have been so much misrepresented; but of this we heard nothing, till of late some Students of Divinity came to us, and offered to dispute our Theses with us, thinking themselves somewhat interessed in the challenge, because in the beginning of these positions it's said, *To all Doctors, Professors, and Students in Divinity*, &c. while indeed these Theses were chiefly designed for those who misrepresented us; yet seing these young men challenged us, (lest we should seem to be refractory) we accepted it, and are now present to defend the justness of our cause; as we refuse not the greatest and strongest, so we despise not the weakest: and the Students are either come as privat or publick persons; if ye be come as publick persons, then what ever is said by you, must be thought as said by your Teachers; but if ye be come only as privat persons, to propound some doubts, we are here ready, and think our selves bound in conscience to answer and resolve them. *A. Sh.* You see, Præses, how he consumes the time with his long discourses, contrary to the Articles. *R. B.* No, no, Præses, I have just now done, I have just now done. Here the young-men challenged the Quakers for breach of Articles, in making this a publick dispute, whereas they obliged themselves to make it a privat one: and offered to prove that they had invited the most of *Aberdene*, which was attested by many of the hearers. After that they challenged *Alexander Skeen* Quaker, for moderating conjunctly with *Andrew Thom-*

§. 2.

There are many things justly censurable in this 1. Sect. but we will not stay to particularize them.

ſon, which being owned by him and his friends, they were challenged again for breach of promiſe, having engaged to the young-men, that they ſhould not chuſe any who was a Quaker to moderat for them. The Quakers denyed that they had condeſcended to any ſuch thing; adding, that ſeing we had choſen one of our perſwaſion, how could they be hindered to chooſe one of theirs: *An. Thomſon*, here interpoſed, and ſaid, there needs not ſo much debate about this, for we are choſen not to have a deciſive judgement, but only to moderat, and to ſee whether the Articles be obſerved. But the Students alwayes ſtood to their former aſſertion, and ſaid they would not admit a Quaker Moderator, but keep them to their promiſe. *R. B.* upon this turned himſelf to the people, and had a diſcourſe to them, ſhewing they were come there to give accompt of the hope that was in them, and to inform the people. The Students cryed out to the Præſes, that now he was preaching to the people, and would continue ſo doing the whole time, if he were permitted. The Præſes told him, that he was not come there for any ſuch end, but that he was come to defend his Theſes, and to inform the people no otherwiſe, then by the anſwers which he ſhould give to the Arguments.

§. 3. *Alexander Brown* (a young man who would not ſubſcribe the Articles, and yet was willing to diſpute, becauſe he was challenged) ſaid unto them, did ye not promiſe that this ſhould only be a private Diſpute. *John Skeen*, Præſes, you ſee how this young man contrary to the Articles doth ſpeak, whereas he hath not ſubſcribed. *A. T.* the Article is, that none ſhall ſpeak, but they who have ſubſcribed, or ſhall ſubſcribe, before the Diſpute begin; but ſo it is that the Diſpute is not begun, and ſo conſequently the young man may as yet ſubcribe, and ſo be admitted to ſpeak. *Quakers*, Let him ſubſcribe then. *Alexander Brown*, No, Præſes, I here proteſt that I am ready to Diſpute, and ought to be admitted, becauſe I got ſeveral challenges: I will ſubmit to all the known and owned Laws of Diſpute, but ſubſcribe I will not, becauſe your conditions are not fair, and becauſe of other reaſons beſt known to my ſelf; and alſo at the drawing up of theſe Articles, I did proteſt for the ſame, and therefore ſay, yet ye promiſed that it ſhould be but a private Diſpute; and I atteſt all here, if there be not ſome hundreds preſent. *R. B.* That is not our fault. *A. Brown*, Yea, we ſhall take it to prove, that ye went and invited perſons to the Diſpute. *R. B.* I think that young man intends to diſanul the Diſpute altogether.

A. Sh

A. Sh. Præſes, Sir, I deſire liberty to ſpeak, as for Mr. *Brown*, becauſe he will not ſubſcribe, we will not own him as one of our number. Ye ſee we are in a great confuſion, I would have you command ſilence, according to the authority committed to you, till we may ſpeak alſo, concerning the occaſion of this Diſpute, and then we ſhall proceed to our work: This being granted, he ſpake thus, If we did not fear that it would divert us from our work, it would not be amiſs to tell you (Sirs) who are the hearers, the occaſion of this Diſpute at large, and to diſprove much of *Robin Barclays* long diſcourſe; only now know this briefly, that *Robin Barclay* ſome moneths ago, for, and in name of the Quakers, did emit printed Theſes of Divinity, and provoked all the Clergy of Europe, of what ſort ſoever, but more particularly of Great Britain, to diſpute (here they denyed that they had provoked all Europe; but he deſired them to look to the Latine Theſes) whether there was vanity in theſe boaſtings and braggings, or not (here he was interrupted for reflecting contrary to the Articles: but anſwered, I ſay, let the moderate and diſcreet perſons judge, you ſhould not anſwer before you hear:) We humbly conceive our Miniſters and Preachers do well not to trouble themſelves with ſuch things, and need not ſubmit the truth being already eſtabliſhed ſufficiently both by the Laws of God and man, to any ſuch diſpute, for whatever ſhould have been the event of it, theſe men could have boaſted of victory. But here are we ſome few young Schollars, who have in the ſtrength of the Lord undertaken the work, being preſſed thereto by the frequent and importunat challenges from the Quakers themſelves; and ſuppoſing alſo, that whatever may be the event now, they will have little reaſon to glory, neither will the truth upon the one hand incurr great diſadvantage, though we come ſhort: But their cauſe upon the other hand will get a fatal blow, and the truth a conſidereble advantage, if they come ſhort, they being the great Prophets of their Sect, and we only but young Schollars. The moſt of our Students of Divinity have declined this Diſpute for ſeveral reaſons, and among the reſt, becauſe we could not obtain ſo fair and reaſonable conditions as might have been expected and wiſhed from the Quakers: And to inſtance in one thing, they would not ſubſcribe againſt railing; *G. Keiths* expreſs words were (*what is railing in thee, is not railing in me, for I have it immediatly from the Spirit; and thou may as well bid me deny my principle, as forbear theſe words which thou calls railing*) §. 4.

railing) (Here *G. K.* would have ſpoken, but was hindered by *A. Sh.* who ſaid, you ſhould not interrupt me, ſeing I have gotten liberty to ſpeak; and for this, according to the Laws, you ought to be debarred from further ſpeaking) but we have reſolved to paſs by theſe things as much as we can, and having an eye at Gods glory, the good of his Church, and the promoting of truth, have ingaged our ſelves in this debate: we indeed confeſs our ſelves to be moſt inſufficient for the work, but we hope in the Lord. The reſt alſo of the Diſputants have appointed me to diſpute firſt, becauſe I was one of thoſe who was moſt provoked by their frequent and importunat challenges, and had a great hand in the firſt undertaking of this Diſpute. We mind not to touch any Theſes which are not peculiar to the Quakers, and think it not needful, for if we overturn Quakeriſm, we have our intent.

§. 5. *G. K.* offered to reply, but *A. Sh.* denyed him liberty, and told, if he were permitted to reply, and we again to duply, ſo, we might conſume the whole time, and never come to the work: *G. K.* See how unreaſonable he is, who firſt calumniats me, and then will not give me liberty to clear my ſelf. *A. Sh.* All of us here do atteſt the things ſpoken for truth, and mind not now to inſiſt on further probation of them. *A. Th.* No, Mr. *Keith* is to reply once, that he may clear himſelf of ſuch things, and ſo the people having both your teſtimonies, may think as they pleaſe. *G. K.* ſpake to this purpoſe, The young man hath miſrepreſented me in many things, but to be ſhort, we denyed to ſubſcribe againſt railing, becauſe we are ſufficiently obliged already by the Word of God not to rail. (*A. Sh.* interrupted him, So are you obliged to many other things, which nevertheleſs are contained within the Articles) *G. K.* proceeds thus; We take God to witneſs, and our Conſciences, we do not own railing, it's not our principle; only many things we ſay are called railing, which are not railing, though ye take them to be railing, yet we ſay they are true, and believe them indeed to be ſo, and therefore do not rail. *A. Sh.* Firſt of all, you have in your Preface condemned all Skool Divinity, and yet throughout your Theſes, you have made very much uſe of it, and thereby have obſcured matters from the people; for how many underſtand *objectum formale, regula fidei*, and the like? But the firſt Theſis that I will impugn, is the ſecond, who defends it, let him read it. *A. Th.* All is alike with them, let any of them do it. *R. B.* reads the ſecond Theſis; and in the mean while,

as

as he was reading about the evidence of the Spirit, the people were speaking among themselves about this evidence, and *John Leslie* promised to speak something of it, whereupon he, upon the desire of Bailie *Skeen*, and others, (*A. Sh.* condescending thereto) began and propounded the first Argument thus: *R. B.* also calling him to come out with it.

Section II.

Containing the first Argument, by John Leslie.

§. 1. *John Leslie.* That is not the rule of faith, which we ought not to believe as the rule of faith. But we ought not to believe the Spirit as the rule of faith; therefore, it's not the rule of faith. *R. B.* (after he was caused to repeat the Argument) denyed the second Proposition. *J. L.* proves it thus: (*a*) we ought not to believe that, as the rule of faith, of which there can be no evidence in the world given. But there can be no evidence in the world given of the Spirit, that is in the Quakers, therefore we ought not to believe it, as the rule of faith. *R. B.* (*b*) answers to the second Proposition, that we most rescind and abstract the Spirit of God from the spirit that is in the Quakers. *J. L.* and the *St.* cryed out, they confess their spirit is not the Spirit of God. *J. L.* I prove that it's the spirit which is in the Quakers, that ye make the rule of faith, thus we have not the Spirit revealing the Doctrine of faith in our selves: If the Spirit of God

The Censure of the Quakers pretended true and faithful Account.

Argument I.

(a) *TO pass by the smaller transgressions, because we have designed brevity; They have* perverted *this second Syllogism, by foysting in the words* (to evidence it self to be a rule) *whereas it spake only of* any evidence in the world, *indefinitly, and was understood of an evidence that the spirit in them is the Spirit of God.* 1. *This is clear from the rest of the Argument: see our account,* Sect. 2, 3, 4, &c. *see their account,* pag. 16. lin. penult, *and forward,* p. 20. l. 5. p. 58. l. 8. p. 61, 62, 64, &c. 2. *Suppose that the Spirit reveal the objects of faith immediatly, none will deny that he is a rule* (or rather ruler) *to them who have him so: and how then would we have sought an evidence for that. They have also* perverted *this Syllogism, by taking out the words* (we ought not to believe that, as the rule of faith) *and putting in these words* (is not to be a rule) *in their place, and so making it insufficient to prove*

the

God be the rule of faith, it must be the ſpirit which is in the Quakers, or not, chooſe you. *R. B.* I diſtinguiſh; if thou mean that ſpirit which is peculiar to the Quakers, as Quakers; it hath no evidence, and is not the rule of faith; but if thou underſtand that univerſal Spirit of God which is natural to all men, and given to them to profit withal, it is our rule.

§. 2. *J. L.* (c) Ye ought to anſwer our Dilemma; I have ſaid, either your ſpirit is Gods Spirit, or not: there is not a *medium*. Are we oblidged to believe you? *G. K.* Yes, ye are obliged to believe us. *J. L.* Then anſwer the Dilemma; either ye can give ſome evidence of Gods Spirit in you, or not. *R. B.* (d) I retort thy Argument upon thy ſelf, as thy Maſter anſwered the Jeſuit; I mean *Dempſter contra Menzies*, with his (e) long Golunzies; for the Jeſuit preſſing him to aſſigna ground for the Proteſtant Religion, he deſires him to prove, that the Proteſtant Religion had no ground for it. *J. L.* Mr. *Menzies* can anſwer for himſelf. *St.* that is againſt the Articles to inhere on retortions. *R. B.* cauſed read the fifth Article, and *J. L.* anſwered, that Mr. *Menzies* did really aſſign the Jeſuit a ground, and I am not deſiring Arguments for your evidence, nor againſt us; only barely aſſign your evidence, and I ſhall argument againſt it. (f) *St.* We proteſt theſe men are ſhifting us, and can give us no evidence.

§. 3. *J. L.*

the ſecond propoſition denyed by R. B. *which we would not have done, nor they admitted.*

(b) *Here alſo they have* omitted *the things that are between this perverted Syllogiſm and their firſt diſtinction, which ſmelleth rankly of non-ſenſe; and if it be not ſo, yet it may be marvelled at: For it diſtinguiſhes the Spirit of God from that ſpirit which they peculiarly aſſume to themſelves, as Quakers, even as it is in their own account. Here among other things they have omitted theſe words of ours* (we have not the Spirit revealing the Articles of faith in our ſelves) *that they might maliciouſly conceal the true way how we went over* Barclay's *anſwer, and deſcended* à Theſi ad Hypotheſin.

§. 2. (c) *Here they have* omitted *the things that preceed the retortion, among which that anſwer of* G. K. (yes, ye are obliged to believe us) *is notour, and, as we conceive, will be acknowledged even by himſelf.*

(d) *They alſo have* miſplaced *the retortion, having brought it againſt another perverted Argument, and have accordingly* perverted it: *We prove it thus, it was propounded in this place; for we having declined to anſwer it, becauſe it might have been long inſiſted on, according to the Articles, and they yet ſtill preſſing it, we beat them off with this Dilemma,* (either it is your own declaration which is your evidence to us, or ſome other thing) *which comes in after this place, and not after the other place, and which we had never*

propounded

§. 3. *J. L.* Seing ye will have it so, if ye had any evidence, either it would be the evidence of your own declaration of having it, or some other evidence. But none of these are evidences; therefore, none. *R. B.* (g) There is a *medium* betwixt these two. *J. L.* cryed out, O obsurd! a *medium* betwixt that, or some other thing. *G. K.* I deny thy second proposition, it hath both these. *J. L.* I prove the *minor per partes*, and the second branch first, because most difficult. If there were any other evidence, (h) it could be told, or not told. *G. K.* It can be told to the well disposed understanding. *J. L.* Ye ought not to deny us an evidence altogether, on that account, for then ye cannot give us an evidence, till our judgements be disposed to own Quakerism; either then ye can assign us some other evidence beside your own declaration, that ye have Gods Spirit, or ye cannot. *R. B.* It can be told to you, it is Gods Spirit teaching us to live godly, righteously and soberly, & to deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts. *J. L.* (i) I am not asking what your spirit is, but an evidence that ye are led immediatly by Gods Spirit. *R. B.* And do we not give you that evidence, when we say that our spirit

propounded for extorting an evidence out of them, if they had assigned one willingly, as they falsly affirm, p. 15. l. 3. *in their account: and moreover it was not propounded in the other place, as we shall shew there, therefore it being propounded in this place, it was, as we have set it down*, viz. (they would not assign us an evidence of their spirit, but would had us to prove that they had none, because our Master dealt so with Jesuit *Dempster*) *without any mention of* (pretending) *for so only it meets with our argument, which presseth them to assign us an evidence, without any mention of* (pretending.

(e) *In their account they have* omitted *it, to conceal his lightness, in canting rythemes, and his malice in attributing it to the wrong person, if he refer the words* (long Golunzies) *to Mr.* Menzies; *for Mr.* Colvil *the Author of the lines refers them only to Mr.* Dempster.

(f) *They are ashamed of their* shifting, *and therefore have* omitted *this, and all the rest which we used as means to extort an evidence from them.*

§. 3. (g) *It is notour that* R. B. *thus asserted a* medium *between this* and some other thing; *and so hasted himself notably, which they have in their account* omitted, *lest they should discredit the publishers of their Theses: and also given him* G. Keiths *answer, (as they have done often throughout the Dispute) but perverted.*

(h) *They have* changed *this Dilemma into a Question, and have forgotten* G. Keiths *answer, about the* well disposed understanding, *which is notour; and also* J. Lesslies *reply.*

(i) *They have* omitted *these words of* J. L. *though they be notour, and the answer to them, because they they could not otherwise have left out*

denyes all ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, and teaches us to live godly, righteouſly and ſoberly. *J. L.* (*k*) That your ſpirit really does ſo, we cannot know; therefore it cannot be an evidence to us; and that your ſaying it does ſo, cannot be an evidence, I prove thus clearly.

§. 4. That which would be as good an evidence for Hereticks and hereſies as for you, cannot be a ſufficient evidence to us from you: But that evidence would be as good an evidence for Hereticks and hereſies as for you, therefore it cannot be a ſufficient evidence to us from you. *G. K.* It is no good evidence for hereſies. *J. L.* Other Enthuſiaſt Hereticks declare and ſay, they have the Spirit of God teaching them as well as you (for there hath been, and are many ſuch in the world beſides Quakers) therefore if your word, and declaring that you are ſo taught, were a ſufficient evidence for you, then their word, and declaring the like, were a ſufficient evidence for them. *G. K.* (*l*) begins to ſpeak to the people, and is preſſed again to aſſign his evidence. *St.* All the company may ſee how they are ſhifting us; they will never aſſign us that other evidence, which they promiſed us, beſides their own ſaying, that they have the Spirit of God.

(*k*) *They have exceedingly wronged us here,* omitting *the firſt part of* J. L. *his words, as we were ſaying;* (that your ſpirit really teaches us to deny all ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, we cannot know, *&c.*) *and alſo* perverting *the ſecond part of his words, by taking out* (which would be as good an evidence for Hereticks and hereſies, as for you) *and foyſting in in lieu thereof* (which Hereticks may pretend to.) *They wanted not their own ends in doing ſo, for they would make our plea as ill as the Jeſuits againſt* Mr. Menzies, *that they might miſplace and make ſtrong their retortion, and inſult, as they have done in their appendices and poſtſcripts. It is notour that there was but one retortion made in this firſt Argument, neither do they put more in their account. Now that it was the retortion ſet down in our Papers,* §. 2. *and not the retortion ſet down in theirs, we prove thus: we argued not from* (pretending) *but from* being as good; *neither would we have done ſo; for we know very well that Hereticks can pretend to the true rule of faith,* viz. *the Scripture: and if we had done ſo, ſurely they would not have let it paſs without a poſitive denyal or diſtinction of the* major, *as they have done: Neither would* G. K. *have denyed our* miuor, *as he did; (which denyal of his, with our probation thereof, is very notour.) Therefore we having argued from* being as good, *and not from* pretending, *it was not propounded in this place, nor was it this retortion, for it ſhould not met with the Argument.*

§. 4. (*l*) *They have* omitted *this their ſhifting.*

(m) *In*

God. *G. K.* (*m*) answers, there is a twofold evidence, an external, and an internal. The internal is that which the Quakers call the Spirit of God, and is that immediat evidence which is in our breast, and indeed this is the most satisfactory to me. The external evidence is that which by all Protestants is looked upon as the greatest evidence, and it is the testimony of the Scriptures. *J. L.* As for the first, to wit, your internal testimony, that falls under the first branch of my Dilemma, to wit, the declaration of having the Spirit, which we have clearly overthrown already, in the Argument drawn from the declaration of the Enthusiast Hereticks, and we shall more fully speak to it afterwards: But now the second branch is in hand, and as for your external testimony, *viz.* the Scriptures, Here *G. K.* interrupaed him, saying, I prove my self to have the Spirit of God. *J. L.* I attest you all, if he hath the Spirit of God, since he imposeth contradictions upon us, to wit, to be Impugners and Defenders both at one time. *G K.* We never said, that we were infallibly directed by the Spirit of God in every word we speak. *J. L.* We cannot know when ye are infallibly directed, or when not; and so when ye speak, that the Spirit is working in you, we cannot know whether it be true or false. *G. K.* proceeds, notwithstanding hereof, to prove that he had the Spirit of God; every man hath the Spirit of God, but I am a man, I hope, therefore I have the Spirit of God. *J. L.* We desire an evidence that Gods Spirit dwelleth in you in a peculiar way, as ye would have folks believe, but according to that Argument we have the Spirit of God and his testimony, as well as ye: and again, either we ought to believe your proofs and evidences, as brought from Scripture, or not. *G. K.* says, ye ought.

J. L.

(m) *In this* 4. §. *they have also conjoyned* G. K. *his speech, wherein he assigns the two evidences, and his speech, wherein he attempts to prove that he hath the Spirit of God, omitting the intermediate interlocutions, some whereof are notour; as* G. Keiths *disclaiming the infallible guidance of the Spirit in every word that they speak;* J. L. *his replying, that we have the Spirit of God as well as they according to that argument, and perverting* Mr. Keiths *Argument, proving that he has the Spirit of God, whereof the minor* (But I am a man, I hope) *is exceeding notour: and adding two Texts of Scripture, which being remarkable might easily have been remembred, if they had been but once mentioned; But we do here appeal to the peoples memories, if there was any such thing: And nevertheless shall discuss them afterwards.*

§. 5. J. L. (n) I prove that we ought not to believe you proving any thing out of Scriptures, for then we should know and believe, that the Scriptures are a sufficient and full tryal of your spirit, and of all other your opinions; but this is against your principle of the necessity of new revelations, and against your Writers denying the Scriptures to be the tryal of your spirits. G. K. carps at the word tryal, and bids lay touchstone. Nay, quoth J. L. I will not use your Metaphorical terms, though I could use the word Rule. G. K. and R. B. owns the Scriptures as the best external and secondary rule in the world. J. L. (o) Either that secondary and external rule is a sufficient tryal and rule, to let us know, that your spirit is a true spirit, or it is not sufficient. If the first, then the Scriptures should be tryed and tryed in respect of the same Spirit. If the last, then the Scriptures are an insufficient evidence for your spirit and revealed opinions. G. K. *Secundum me, verum, secundum te, falsum*; according to thee, they are a most sufficient rule, and you are obliged to stand to any proof that I shall bring out of them, because they are your principal rule. J. L. Ye ought to answer us according to your own principles, and ye are not to answer us *ad hominem*, we are come only to impugn your principles.

§. 6. (p) Likewise, that is not a sufficient evidence according to you Quakers to us, which may be fallacious according to you Quakers.

§. 5. (n) *They have* omitted *this first argumentation, and* G. K. *his carping at the word* (Tryal) *which is notour, and doubtless will be confest by himself; and have* misplaced *their distinction, wherewith they endeavour to shift us.* (o) *They have* omitted *this argumentation altogether, & have* omitted *the answer to it, together with* J. L. *his reply out of this place, and inserted them only in a following place, whereas they should be in both; for they had no other solution, wherewith they might* shift *us off in any of the places.*

§. 6. (p) *They have mutilated this Syllogism.* G. Keith *would have been stealing the words* (according to you Quakers without the in-dwelling of the Spirit) *out of the conclusion; and no wonder that he has maimed the Syllogism some way or other, for he engaged his credit on the stage to prove that it had four terms. But take notice, he then challenged the* minor, *because there was something* (*to wit*, without the in-dwelling of the Spirit) *in it, which was not in the* major: *wherefore all that were present laughed at him; and we told him, that these words are not a term, but a part of the* subjectum *in the* minor *and conclusion. And now we adde, that* (a sufficient evidence according to you Quakers) *is the* majus extremum (Scripture testimony without the testimony of the Spirit) *the* minus extremum, *and* (fallacious according to you Quakers) *the* medium. *But now he adds a margine to their account, wherein we*

are

kers. But, according to you Quakers, the Scriptures teſtimony may be fallacious to us without the indwelling of the Spirit; therefore, according to you Quakers, the Scriptures teſtimony without the indwelling of the Spirit, is not a ſufficient evidence to us. *G. K.* having repeated it, ſimply denyes the concluſion, alledging there were four *termini* in it, and that it was a Sophiſm, and that theſe words (without the in-dwelling of the Spirit) was the fourth *terminus*; and likewiſe added this reaſon, becauſe that there ſhould be nothing in the *minor*, but what was in the *major*. *J. L.* and the reſt of the Students ſcorned him for ill Logicks, in ſaying, that there ſhould be nothing in the *minor*, but what was in the *major*; adding, that the words (without the in-dwelling of the Spirit) was not a *terminus*, but a part of the *ſubjectum* in the *minor* and concluſion. *G. K.* I offer to prove that the Syllogiſm hath four termes, either before your Maſters, or any Logicians in this Univerſity. *J. L.* and Students, aſſerted boldly, that it was a good Syllogiſm, and heartily referred it to the Maſters of Philoſophy, and ſaid it was the beſt time to prove it now. And *J. L.* added, though it were not ſo very formal, as yet it is, its no wonder, ſince I frame things abruptly from your words, and invented diſtinctions. (*q*) Here *Alex. Skeen* (becauſe the Students ſcorned the Quakers Logicks) ſaid, I am ſorry to ſee thoſe, who profeſs themſelves Students *are not concerned, not having ſubſumed any thing which was not in the firſt propoſition or concluſion: yet becauſe* Mr. George *appeals to all Logicians, we anſwer, to ſhew his ignorance, that there may be ſomething in the* minor *that is not in the* major, *nor concluſion (as well as there may be ſomething in the* minor, *that is not in the* major, *which was the thing in queſtion upon the ſtage) and yet the ſyllogiſm not have four terms, and give him an example in* Celarent [nullum animal eſt lapis; omnis homo eſt animal, ergo nullus homo eſt lapis] *where ſomething (to wit,* omnis *is in the* minor, *which is not in the* major *nor concluſion, and yet who will ſay that it hath four terms? And moreover, he has taken the foreſaid words out of the concluſion; for if theſe words had been really wanting in the concluſion, or G. K. had ſeen any other errour in the Syllogiſm, he had ſurely diſcovered it, to ſhew our weakneſs before the hearers, ſome whereof were intelligent enough, eſpecially being ſo ſcorned for his bad Logicks; whereas he only quarrelled us for putting ſomething in the* minor, *which was not in the* major, *and is ſo far from being a fault, that he was hiſſed at for challenging it, and indeed deſerves to be degraded out of the number of Maſters of Arts, for his aſſerting the contrary.*

(*q*) *We have not concealed our laughing, becauſe we intended to be ingenuous; nor the check which Al. Skeen gave us; but we ſhall apologize for it afterwards.*

(*r*) *The*

Students of Divinity, ſo little ſerious in the truths of God. But *G. K.* paſſing from the form, cauſed *J. L.* repeat the Syllogiſm over and over. Therefore *J. L.* ſaid, yes, I ſhall repeat it over again, that ye may be ſetting your wits on work to find out an anſwer. After this *G. K.* denyed the *minor*, harping on the word, *in-dwelling*. *Al. Sh.* (r) Ye diſtinguiſh very ſubtilly betwixt in-being and in-dwelling, and the inward teſtimony of the Spirit, we therefore will have the word (*in-dwelling*) taken out, and the word (*teſtimony of the Spirit*) put in ſtead thereof, and the Argument will remain as ſtrong as before. *J. L.* proveth the *minor*.

§. 7. (ſ) A proof or evidence deduced from Scriptures may be fallacious according to you, or we may be beguiled with it, for ought we know, becauſe we know not that the Spirit gives teſtimony to ſuch a ſenſe of Scripture, the knowing whereof, only can aſſure us of the right ſenſe of Scripture according to you; and therefore *G. K.* anſwers, by upbraiding him, ſaying thy heart is too near thy mouth. *J. L.* afterwards ſaid, the Scriptures may beguile us according to you. *R. B.* We may beguile our ſelves, but the Scriptures cannot begnile us. *A. Sh.* They ſay the Scriptures cannot beguile a man; look then to the Scriptures, and care not for their revelations. *R. B.* Speak louder yet. *G. K.* I wiſh my words could reach from one end of the world to another. *J. L.* Write up

(r) *This is not only* miſplaced *by them, being ſet down in the very end of this Argument, which is known to have been ended at the paſſage about the* Circle; *but alſo given it in to* G. K. *as an anſwer, whereas he only ſpoke the word* (in-dwelling) *with an Emphaſis, and we then our ſelves changed the term, becauſe we had read this diſtinction in their Pamphlets.*

§. 7. (ſ) *They have* omitted *this reaſon of the* minor, *in which theſe words* (for ought we know, are not our) *and to which they returned nothing but a Sarcaſtick phraſe, which is no-iour, as they did ordinarily when they had little to ſay: and they have attributed to us a Syllogiſm, which proves* idem per idem (viz. that the Scripture-teſtimony, &c. is fallacious, becauſe it may beguile a man.) *But we would never have argued this, neither would they let it paſs unchecked: and have alledged, that it was challenged for informality.*

(t) *We would not conceal this expreſſion, though it be ambiguous indeed, and to be taken* cum grano ſalis. *We meant not, that the Scripture, as ſuch, is hurtful, according to the Quakers, but that we may beguile our ſelves with it, according to the Quakers, for want of the Spirit to tell us the true ſenſe of it; as we when we heard their anſwer on the Stage, expounded it (which they have* diſſembled *in their account) and we as yet own it, for it is no more, than that the Scripture is fallacious according to the Quak.* propter defectum

ex

up these words. *G. K.* I wish they were written in letters of gold. The Scriptures cannot beguile us, but we may beguile our selves with them, if we want the Spirits testimony, and know it not. *J. L.* But we may be beguiled with the Scriptures, according to you; for we cannot know the true sense of Scripture without knowing the Spirits testimony to the same; therefore, we not knowing that the Spirit gives testimony to such and such a sense of Scripture, we may be beguiled with it. *R. B.* Prove that. *J. L.* I have proved it, and again, I prove it; *(u)* either without such testimony of your spirit we may be beguiled, or not; if we cannot be beguiled, then the Scriptures without such testimony of the Spirit are a sufficient rule to make us know all the will of God. *G. K.* They are so *secundum te*, and likewise, ye can know the sense of Scripture, according to your selves, and therefore ye ought to receive our proofs without knowing such testimony of the Spirit, but the Spirit is the chief rule *secundum me*. *J. L.* Ye ought to answer our proofs according to your own principles, and to deal with us as we were false Hereticks; for so ye accompt us; and therefore ye ought not to evidence your spirit to us meerly upon that which your spirit must think a falshood, to wit, that we can be sure of Scripture-sense without knowing the Spirits testimony thereto. And whether ye call the Scriptures a seconday rule, or not, since they are once a sufficient rule, telling all the will of God, and opinions of faith, there is no necessity of new revelations, and this is against thy fundamental. *G. K.* Thou sayes, the Scriptures could beguile ex parte objecti: *Yea, in such cases such expressions are usual; For suppose a man even with a clear eye looking to an ill disposed* (male dispositum) *object, even in a due distance mistake it, in that case it may be, and is ordinarily said, that such an object hath beguiled him: This may be easily applyed. In the mean time, Quakers may leave this to be quarrelled by others; for they deliver almost all the points of their Religion in Allegorical terms.*

(u) They have omitted *this Dilemma, which proved, on the one hand, that there was no necessity of new objective revelations; and on the other hand, that we could have no evidence of their spirit from the Scripture, seing we know not the testimony of the Spirit, which alone tells the true sense of the Scripture. For it is well known, and as we conceive, the Quakers will not deny, that, when* J. L. *proved the second part of it,* R. B. *gave in this pitiful answer,* (I think the young-man disputes round about in a Circle) *and we again shew, that they were in a compleat Circle, which was the last thing material in the Argument, and very notour, albeit they have* omitted *it.*

(x) This

guile us, whereas they are an innocent and true testimony, and cannot beguile any man, but they who know not the *Spirits* testimony, will beguile themselves with the *Scriptures*.

§. 8. *J. L.* I clear that, and argue against you thus on the other hand: we, not knowing the testimony of the *Spirit*, may beguile ourselves with the *Scriptures*, therefore, we can have no sufficient evidence of your spirit out of them, because its the knowledge of the testimony of the *Spirit* to such a sense, which only can assure us that such is the true sense of *Scriptures*, and this is all the thing in question. *R. B.* I think the young man disputes round about in a Circle. *J. L.* Yes, it is very true, there is a compleat circle committed in your evidence to us; for we must believe the testimony of your spirit, because such is the sense of *Scripture*, and we must believe such to be the sense of *Scripture*, because of your spirits testimony thereto, out of which Circle I see not how ye will extricat yourselves. *St.* They must confess they can give us no evidence of their spirit out of the *Scriptures*, but that, notwithstanding whereof, we may be deceived (a fallacious evidence indeed) or then let them shew us how they will win over these proofs. *J. L.* would have been proving more fully the other branch of his Argument, as he promised, but the Moderator and hearers would not permit him, saying, this Argument is well enough tossed already, and their meer saying and declaring that they have the *Spirit*, can never be a sufficient evidence to others. *G. K.* (x) come away with thy bottles, if there be any more water in them, pour it out. *J. L.* I have just now poured out as much as hath drowned out your spirit.

§. 8. (x) *This boasting expression of G. Keiths is misplaced, and the answer of it falsly ascribed to A. Shireff, who reads in our account, what was the occasion of the same.*

the next Argument, of which they will be perswaded,

Section III.

Containing the Second Argument.

By Alexander Shirreff.

§. 1. *A. S.* I Dispute against the latter part of the second Thesis, where you make Divine inward Revelations absolutely necessary for building up of true faith: (y) That is to say, we should not

(y) *From this to the end of the Paragraph, they have mis-*

not believe any thing that is revealed in the Scriptures, except it be over again revealed unto us. *R. B.* We should believe them historically without these revelations. *A. Sh.* We shall then say you maintain that we should believe nothing which is revealed in the Scriptures, except it be historically, unless they be revealed over again unto us. *G. K.* We say, the Scriptures are such even without the inward testimony of the Spirit, that they do more oblidge Protestants, then any other Books in the world, upon the account of outward reasons of probability, and consent of all ages and Churches, which all do agree in this, however differing in other things; but we cannot believe the Scriptures with a true divine faith, except they be over again revealed unto us. *R. B.* Let us call it saving faith. *G. K.* The Scriptures without the Spirit may ground an historical faith in the highest degree, but not a saving faith, except they be revealed over again unto us. *A. Sh.* The sense of your Thesis is then that we should not believe the things contained in the Scriptures with a true divine and saving faith, except they be revealed over again unto us, *de novo.*

§. 2. I need not ask what revelations you do mean, for your selves do admit subjective revelation, or divine illumination, to be necessary to saving faith, and yet contend further for new objective revelations: Now it remains, that ye or we explain the words, that the people may understand. *G. K.* Explain these words to the people according to the Articles. *A. Sh.* Give me a Bible here, and turn over to the last of *Luke*, and the (*a*) 44. *verf.* Christ sayes unto his Disciples, *These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms, concerning me.* Here we have objective revelations, without subjective revelations; for the objects, the things to be done and believed, were revealed in Moses and the Prophets, and the Psalms, and likewise were taught the Disciples by Christ; but the subjective revelation came but afterward, *verf.* 45. *Then opened he their understandings, &c.*

misplaced all; *and been very unfaithfull in setting down all these things, as spoken successively, and at once, by* G. K. *of his own free will, whereas it is notour, that they were questioned once, and again, about the sense of their Thesis, and both* G. K. *and* R. B. *answered several times, before they could agree about it; and whiles both spake together, & omitting diverse things as* G. K. *saying thus* [the Scripture oblidges Protestants, *&c.*] *and* R. B. *his bidding* [call it a saving Faith] *which are notour.* (*z*) *That is to say, we ought to believe the Scriptures as we do* Titus Livius.

§. 2. (*a*) *This is unfaithfully related, for it was the 44. and 45 verses that were read, & not the 27. although these verses*

R. B. (*b*) Thou has given no definition of them as yet. *A. Sh.* I have explained them sufficiently already, and I tell over again, that objective revelation is the revealing and the propoling of things to be done and believed, though there be no help given for the discerning and understanding of them. But subjective revelation, or divine illumination, is the clearing and inlightning of the understanding, that it may perceive and discern the things revealed. *G. K.* I have heard the young mans explication, but I find him defective in it, and therefore I add, that there are two sorts of objects of faith, the material, and formal: the material is that which is delivered to be done and believed, and is the *quod credendum*; but the formal object is the principal motive why we believe, and the reason *cur credimus*. Now the Scriptures are indeed a part of that which we should believe, but the principal and *proximum motivum* why we should believe, is not the Scriptures, but the Spirit. *A. Sh.* I know not what ye mean, these are not explications of objective and subjective revelations, but of material and formal objects of faith: But I proceed to my Argument, because it will be strong enough, notwithstanding of all these explications. I prove then that there is no new objective revelation necessary for the grounding of a true saving faith.

velations may be explained from it also.

(b) Here they have omitted *R. B.* his causing us repeat this explication, and our checking *G. K.* for explaining the material and formal objects of faith, in place of objective and subjective revelations.

§. 3. (*c*) If there be no such thing as the revelations asserted by you, then no revelations are necessary for the building up of true faith; but the first is true, therefore the last. *R. B.* denyed the second Proposition, and *A. Sh.* proved it thus; if there be no such seed as you maintain, then there is no such revelations as you maintain; but the first is true, therefore the last. *R. B.* denyed the *minor* again. *A. Sh.* You have denyed the *minor*, but however to make all secure, (*d*) I give this reason of the Sequel, first, because the revelations which you maintain, are made in, and by the seed (witness *G. K.* in his first book of *Immediat Revelation*, *pag.* 5. where he teacheth so at large.) Now I prove the *minor*; if there be (*e*) no substantial living principle distinct from the soul, which hears, sees, smells, tastes, and feels, then there is no such seed as ye affert. But the first is true, therefore the last.

(R. B.)

§. 3. (c) *They have* omitted *this first Syllogism altogether; and caused us begin with another, which we would never have done, nor they overlooked, it not bringing in the Elenchus of their Thesis.* (d) *They have forgotten the proof of the Sequel.* (e) *They have egregiously prevaricated here by foysting in the word*

(f) R. B. having repeated the Argument, denyed the *minor*.

§. 4. But G. K. (g) cryed, hold, hold, I will distinguish the *major*, If there be no such seed as we assert, then there is no such revelations as we assert. I distinguish you upon the word *such*, for it's an ambiguous word. (h) *A. Sh.* No, that is not the Argument which we are upon now, but this is it, If there be no substantial living principle, *&c.* then there is no such seed. He often repeated this unto him, and told that the Argument which he was distinguishing, was already admitted by *R.B.* On the other hand, *G. K.* alwayes insisted on this, that we should first speak to the *major*, and then examine the *minor*. *A. Sh.* Go on in the Argument, if you dare, and we shall overturn Quakerism; and though we would permit you to come back, how can you distinguish that proposition, seing it's admitted by your self in your book. *G. K.* We will stand to the denyal of the *minor*, but will first distinguish the *major*; and we appeal to all Philosophers, and to the Preses, if this be not right.

A. T.

§. 4. (g) *Here they* lie *impudently, for* R. B. *spake nothing here of digressing from the Thesis, nor made* G. K. *any such apology here, but they did afterwards, having no other thing to excuse* R. B. *his failings.* R. B. *had no ground for his challenge, for we alwayes proved the thing that was denyed, and that from the very nature of their revelations, seed, &c. We made use of Books in this matter, because we could not know these things but from them; and of* G. K. *his own Book, because we had it beside us: and neither needed* G. K. *to have apologized for his answering Arguments deduced from his Book, more then the other Arguments; for he was as much imployed in answering the other Arguments, both before this and afterwards, as in answering them.* (h) G. K. *did not produce this distinction word* (such) *into the first part of this Syllogism, that* G. K. *may not seem coming back to distinguish a former Syllogism admitted by* R. B. *in which only the word* (such) *really was: But in vain, for we made all the people see him already upon the Stage, and they for the same* (chiefly, *but not only*) *spread the report of his short-coming and ignorance. They have likewise changed the active Verbs* (sees, hears, *&c.*) *into the passives,* (which may be heard, seen, *&c.*) *whereas the actives only are in* G. Keiths *Book, and so they only could be put in this Argument. By this they have wronged us who would never have used the actives; for we grant that the soul hath spiritual sensations, and the work of grace may be felt, though we deny that there is such a substantial living principle, which hears, sees,* &c. (i) *Here immediatly after this Syllogism, they subjoyn the proof of its* minor *out of* George *his Book of* Immediat Revelation, p. 7. *which was not produced here, but only afterwards: For* George *foreseeing the danger better then* Robin, *did not deny the* minor, *as he did, but called us back to a preceeding Syllogism.*

A. Thomson answered, that *G. K.* did not refuse to defend, that the seed was a substantial living principle, but that he was first to distinguish the other proposition. *A. Sh.* Pretes, Sir, he is retracting the thing which *R. B.* granted, and is bringing me back to the last Syllogism, against all rules of disputing. *J.* In the is a kind *Aberdeen's* man, he will not stand at the word that hurts him. *G. K.* Thou was born in *Aberdeen*, and not I, &c. *A. Sh.* But I am so confident of the truth, I shall repeat again that Syllogism cohim, if there be no such seed as you affert, then there is no such revelations as you affert, because I have proved out of *G. K.* Book, revelations and manifestations are made in and by the seed; but the first is true, therefore the last.

immediatly when he offered, as they say; for just then it was told him that he was coming back to another Syllogism, and retracting what R. B. had granted: which is also purposely omitted, to conceal R. B. his pitiful ignorance, and George his impertinency and rudeness, in Baffling him before so many, for they could not have forgotten it otherwise. The hearers know, and the readers may be perswaded, that we were not so unreasonable as to hinder them from speaking to the major of that Syllogism, before they should come to the minor of it, as they falsly insinuat.

§. 5. (i) All that is contained in this Paragraph, is without doubt omitted purposely, to conceal R. B. his impertinency in interrupting G. K.

§. 5. (i) *R. B.* answered, that did not impugn the Thesis, for though there were no such thing as the revelations maintained by us Q. yet other divine revelations should be necessary for the, &c. *A. Sh.* I shall be ready for you there; if there be no such revelations as ye assert, then no revelations at all are necessary, I prove it out of *G K* Book, the words are these, And now seeing the glory of God doth so openly appear, and is so immediatly manifested unto the Saints in the divine seed and birth, in which also they can know his mind and will in any thing he pleases to reveal in them after this manner, therefore have the other manner, by outward apparitions much ceased, nor are they at all needful to continue; yet we do not so limit the Lord, as to say he never shall so appear to any; but it is a thing which we neither desire, nor expect this outward appearance and manifestation in the seed, being that which doth abundantly satisfy those who are come thus to know and converse with him. *G. K.* Thou sees now that we do not deny other revelations besides those that are made in and by the seed. *A. Sh.* Though you do not deny the possibility of other revelations, yet you say that they are not at all needful, you do not desire them, nor expect them; In the 2. page ye say it is only the revelations in and by the seed, that are of necessary continuance, and only can give true knowledge. So if there be no

such

such revelations as you assert, then there is none at all needful according to your selves.

§. 6. *G. K.* I tell thee, that I will distinguish thy first Proposition upon the word *such*, for it is an ambiguous word, if there be no such seed as you assert; if thou mean an universal principle of grace, we admit the proposition, but if thou mean a substantial seed, we decline it, because it would draw us into the deepest of Philosophical niceties. *J. L.* Ye grant then that in some case there is no such seed, as the Q. maintain for your principle. *A. Sh.* (*k*) I have heard this distinction, let me have liberty to answer him: First of all, he declines the word *substantial*, whereas in his Book, *pag.* 6. he upbraids both Teachers and People with woful ignorance and mistakes, touching Immediat Revelation, and the true manner of it, arising upon this account; for they do not acknowledge this seed and birth of God in his Saints, to be a substantial living principle: But again, let him tell me whether or not the foresaid universal principle of grace, which is the one member of the distinction, be not one and the same thing with the substantial principle, which is the other member of the distinction. *R. B.* He is disputing against the Book all day, and not against the Thesis. *J. L.* (*l*) Ye maintain your selves to be infallibly directed by the Spirit, and so it comes all to one thing. *A. Sh.* Nay, it's your common Doctrine, and I have alwayes brought in the *Elenchus*, and proved the *negatum*; and if you will I shall resume and let you see it. *R. B.* Thou would fain hear thy self speak to the people. *A. Sh.* Ye are feared that I cause them hate your principles; but does not your very Thesis speak of the pure and spiritual birth Christ formed within. Here the Q. declined to answer positively, and cryed out, they could get nothing from him but Philosophical niceties. *A. S.* (*m*) I shall cast out the word *Substantial*, and shall yet argue against you thus: If there be no living principle in every man and woman which sees, hears, tasts, touches, and smells, then there is no such seed as ye assert, and consequently no such revelations as you assert; but the first is true, therefore the last. *R. B.* Here he brings in a fourth *terminus*, to wit, reve-

§. 6. (k) *This reply is altogether left out by them, lest they should seem unreasonable in declining the word* Substantial.

(l) *As they have misplaced these, R. B. his out-crying against us for digressing from the Thesis, so they have affrontedly left out our answers thereto, some whereof are notour.*

(m) *They have feared to set down this Argument, as reinstaured, wanting the word* (Substantial) *and have been ashamed of that learned answer of R. B. that* (revelations) *is a fourth term; whereby he was really baffled also.*

(n) *We*

revelations. *A. Sh.* Not at all, for it only follows upon the admitting of the sequel. Ye may all know that they are diverting only, and cannot answer us.

§. 7. I proceed therefore to the probation of the *minor*, thus, if there were any such seed, as you assert, it would be either created, or uncreated, choose you. *R.B.* (*n*) It is neither of them; that is not a sufficient enumeration. *A. Sh.* Then there is something uncreated, besides God. Here *G. K.* did remove *R. B.* out of the place, and stood up and answered for him, that it is both, and he would distinguish again upon the word *seed*, being drawn, as he said, by them into Philosophical niceties. (*o*) The word *seed*, may be taken two wayes, for it is either *terminus concretus*, or *abstractus*. *A. Sh.* Preses, Sir, will ye ask the people if they understand what he means by these words, for he would not suffer us so much as to use the terms, which they use themselves in explaining their principles, and yet all their answers are nothing, but the deepest of Philosophical niceties, which they use, to cover the weakness of their cause. *G.K.* Well then, I shall explain them to thee. *A. Sh.* No, we desire not thy explications, but speak so as the people may understand thee. *G. K.* Well then, I do it thus, a *concrete* term is that which contains two things, one in *recto*, and another in *obliquo*. *J. L.* Give us a reason of your distinction, or what absurdity will follow, if the Proposition were not

(n) *We cannot think but the Q. themselves would confess their disingenuity here, if it were not prejudicial to their interest; for it is exceeding notour, that first, R. B. answered that the seed is neither created, nor uncreated: which being refuted, G.K. set by R. B. and having entered into his harvest, answered, that the seed was* [both created, and uncreated] *surely they have* omitted *this also, to conceal the horrid* blasphemy *of R. B. (for to answer as he did, is all one as to say that God created not all things, but there is something even besides God himself, which is not created,) or shall we say, only his woeful ignorance, and the self-contradicting and lying disposition of the Q. spirit? Who now will deny that R. B. baffled himself again by this answer? or who will say that he is fit to judge if Doctrines and Uses be contradictory, which he takes upon him to do, p. 59. of their Pamphlet.* (o) *They have* added *here several things, as that (a concret term is it which hath another belonging to it) and set down the explication of* G.K. *his distinction succinctly, and all of it together almost, whereas on the Stage he explained it very coldly, confusedly, and by halves, as it came into his mind, or he was pressed to it.*

(p) *We*

not so limited. *A. Sh.* The people understand *in recto*, and *obliquo*, still as they did, *in concreto*, and *abstracto*. *G K.* I shall explain it then by an example; *merciful*, and *mercifulness*, are two terms, *merciful* is the concret, and *mercifulness* is the abstract. Now I apply, the blessed eternal God is the seed concretly taken, condescending in a low manner to us, even as (p) *Clemens Alex.* saith, that Christ compared himself to a grain of mustard seed, in his inward appearance in the heart, because he condescends, in a low manner, to the Creatures capacity, and discovers himself to the same. And the manifestation is that which the seed denotes *in obliquo*. So I answer to the question, that God is uncreated, and the manifestation created.

§. 8. *A Sh.* (q) I prove that the seed is not God at all, any wayes considered; thus that which can be measured out in measures and degrees, and can be sometimes more of it, sometimes less of it given to persons, can be formed and grow up from less to more, till it become a perfect substantial birth, and so is not alwayes alike in every place; that, I say, is not God, but your seed is such, therefore it is not God. *G. K.* I am glad that thou hast fallen upon these things, but it is an abuse to call it my seed, or mans seed, for it is the seed of God.

A. Sh. placed this Argument in a ridiculous form.

(p) *We doubt if* Clemens Alex. *say so, but if he do it, he is to be understood of Christs inward appearance, by his illumination and grace, not by new objective revelation: and if the Q. will say otherwise, it lyes upon them to prove it, for this is not the answer, which indeed ought to be impugned by us, but a confirmation of it (wherewith we are not concerned as opponents) or a counter-arguing.*

(q) *They have* misplaced *this, and brought us in immediatly after the explaining of* G. Keiths *distinction, taking in hand to prove that the seed is not a substance, and that the manifestation is not a substance. For proof of their* misplaceing, *we give these reasons,* 1. *It was only in the end of the Argument, that we would have been proving, that the manifestation is not a substance; for it was only there, that we had occasion of it given us (G.K) having asserted in his answers to the argumentations, which interveened betwixt this part and that, that the manifestation is a substance) and likewise, it is notour, that we were setting about this only in the end of the Argument, and that the people caused us leave it, and proceed to another Argument.* 2. *It cannot be conceived, that we would have argued so immediatly after the applying of this distinction, or that they would have let us pass with it, seeing that so we would not have infringed the solution in the least. They have also*

(r) *They*

A. Sh. (*q*) I mean the seed which is asserted by you, and notwithstanding of your gladness, ye will never answer us; for as I hear, Peter was affronted with this in *England G. K.* I distinguish thus, God in himself considered, cannot be measured out and grow, &c. but God in respect of his manifestations, and as an Analogous, or proportionable object to our understandings, he may be measured and grow; and I give a ground for this out of Scripture, It is written, that Jesus got the Spirit without measure, whence I conclude, that others got the Spirit in measure: And *Elishah* the Prophet got a double measure of the Spirit, but God cannot be measured in his beeing, but only in his manifestations. *A. Sh.* repeated his distinction, and then cryed out, (*s*) Is there not a Notar here, that we may take Instrument upon this, that it is only the manifestations, and gifts, and graces of the Spirit, which are measured, formed, and grow: for to grant this, is to render up the cause; and we also follow the exposition of the phrase, Christ formed in us, measure of the Spirit, &c.

§. 9. But (*t*) I shall prove that they measure out God himself, and expound their phrases of his beeing and substance; thus if the substance and living principle asserted by you, is so measured, formed, and grow then God himself is measured out: But the first is true, therefore the last. *G. K.* Adany thy sequel, there is a middle substance distinct from God on the one hand, and from the soul of man on the other hand. *A. Sh.* There is nothing in the seed but God and the manifestation, and yet the seed is measured, and grows from less to more, till it become perfect substantial birth, it must therefore be God or his manifestation that is measured, &c. choose you. *G. K.* It is both. *A. Sh.* The

(*r*) *They have* omitted this, although *it be notour.* (*s*) *They have set this down, but have been ashamed to tell the occasion of it, we put it in its own place. They have* added *also, that R. B. desired that a Notar might take instrument of our lightness then, which is a notorious* lie.

§. 9. (*t*) *In lieu of three or four very material Argumentations contained in this Paragraph, they have attributed but one to us, and that so very sensless and self-contradicting, that none will believe them (to wit* there is nothing in the seed, but God, therefore God, &c. pag. 30 lin. 1, 2. &c.) *to which they have given as sensless and impertinent an answer; and then* added *a multitude of* railing *expressions, all which have been dictated to them, since the time of the Dispute, by a lying spirit. We might shew likewise, that they have misplaced these things, or rather shadows of things; but we will not insist on that.*

God also would be measured out and grow. *G. K.* Not in his beeing, but in his manifestation. *A. Sb.* We are speaking of Gods beeing, and his manifestation, as the one is contradistinguished from the other, and I prove here. *G. K.* interrupted him very often, and was checked for it by the *St.* who desired that upon this account he might be debarred from further speaking, according to the Articles. *A. Sb.* added also, ye measure out that living principle, which hears, sees, and grows up to a perfect substantial birth, in and by which, the manifestations and revelations are made, as *G. K.* teacheth in his Book at large, and therefore ye measure Gods beeing, and not only his manifestations.

§. 10. *G. K.* (*u*) answered, we measure not God in his beeing, but God can come out of his beeing sometimes, and go forth into the creatures beeing. *J. L.* cryed out immediatly to the people, O horrid blasphemy! Gods beeing is God himself, and his God-head; if therefore God can come out of his beeing, he can come from being God himself, and from having his God-head, and consequently can come to be no God at all. *G. K.* replyed, that he came out of his beeing but ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, as he is said in Scripture to come down from Heaven; but this young man, as I perceived by his discourse the other day, is a *Nullibist* in his opinion, and (*x*) maintains that he is as much in *France*, as here. *J. L.* I have several

(*u*) *They are so far from laying Mr.* Keiths horrid blasphemy (*to wit*, God can come out of his beeing) *to his charge; that they bring in* J. L. *proving, that* God cannot come forth into the creatures, because he is in himself; *and* G. K. [illegible] *answering that* he cometh forth into the creatures, *and yet* still in himself, p. 29. *But these lies will not serve the turn, for the blasphemy of* G. K. *is notour, and was so loudly laid to their charge in the Dispute, that they could not have forgotten it, though they would wilfully* omit *it: yea, we marvel how* Mr. Keith *can conceal it, seeing he owned it on the Stage, and went about to justifie himself that he spake it* ἀνθρωποπαθῶς; *which is nevertheless but a silly shift: For,* 1. *There is no such* ἀνθρωποπάθεια *in Scripture, as this.* 2. *These expressions, which are called* Anthropopathias, *are only used out of accomodation to our infirmity, to make the more deep attributes and properties of God to be understood by more visible and sensible things. But this expression* (God can come out of his beeing) *is not so; for a thing continuing the same, to come out of his beeing, is so far from being sensible, that no Metaphysician can truly conceal it. In the mean time, is not this cunningly to pervert the Dispute for their own interest? And may not this be said by us, who have not the priviledge of immediat knowing the heart, when we see it so obvious and clear in their accompt?* (*x*) *Here* G. Keith *thought to put his* blasphemy *out of head, with an* impudent cu-

veral witnesses, that I proved many things then against him, and among the rest, I proved upon him, that the soul is not properly in any place, which is a Cartesian principle, and I will yet maintain it. *A. Sh.* It was so indeed; but to speak to the purpose, there is no such [illegible] as G. K. would be hammering out to be found in the Scriptures, nor is there any reason in the world for the using of it. So now, Sirs, I leave him here speaking both Greek and blasphemy to you, and I press another [illegible]

§. 11. (y) There is nothing in the seed, but God and his manifestations, and yet it's not the manifestation which is the substantial living birth, formed and grown up till to become a perfect substantial birth; therefore it's God: Here he was often interrupted in forming of the Syllogism. G. K. denyed the *minor*, and affirmed that the manifestation was a substance.

§. 12. If the manifestations be of the substance of God, then it is God, for it is an Attribute. (z) What is of God is God; and while he was yet speaking, and telling us all Divines received that known maxime, *Quicquid est in Deo est Deus*, Ouch out, blasphemy, the whole world is of God. J. L. No blasphemy, according to my sense, for I mean wherein the substance of God, is God, since we are speaking of the substance of God. I mean nothing by my English maxime, but what I explained immediately by the known received maxime

himself, *whereof now thinking to be safes only, that it would follow on the principles of the Nullibists, but he continues yet in calling J. L. a Nullibist, because he defended that famous principle at that time, which we judge not to follow, for he often disputeth against that opinion.*

§. 11. (y) *This instance is very not ours, for by the strength of it, G. K. was constrained to say that the manifestation is a substance. But where is it to be found in their account.*

§. 12. (z) *While J. L. was yet speaking, and qualifying his words, he was insolently interrupted by G. K. R. B. &c. and charged with blasphemy: which they might very often, pari jure, do likewise to one reading Scripture,* Actuarii tom. 1. p. 171. Quod dictum benè est, male interpretabatur Haretici. *J. L. would have only been inferring, that the manifestation is God, if it be a substance, because, as A. Sh. had shewn before out of G. K. Book, it is in, of, and by the seed, of God. That the argumentation would have been absolutely valid in it self, we shall not say, neither came it ever in our minds; for the various ways of being in, by, and of God, ought to be distinguished but this we will say, it holds exactly against Q. neither intended we more for they (in FOX his great mystery cited by Fauldo, in his Quakerism no Christianity, p. 124, 125.) conclude the soul to be of God's being, and a part of God, infinite, divine, and what not: because it is of God, and came out from him, which agrees to this manifestation, according*

that

xime in Latine, *Quicquid est in Deo est ipse Deus.* And all that ye can say is to carp at the mistake of the word *of*, for *in*. G. K. (*a*) continued in affirming that the manifestation was a substance. The *St.* cryed out, that they have said that God can come out of his being, and the action of manifestation is a substance: and *A. Sh.* (*b*) offered to prove that the manifestation was not a substance, but an accident: Whereupon R. B. challenged him for breach of promise, because he had promised to leave out the word, *substantial*, and complained to the people, that the Schollars drew them into School niceties. *A. Sh.* I promised only to forbear it in that Syllogism, and yet my Arguments will remain strong, though that word be cast out of them all. G. K. (*c*) What is a substance in one respect, may be an accident in other respects, as gold and silver are real substances in themselves, but they are accidental to me, because I may want them. *A. Sh.* But I shall prove the manifestation is not a real substance in it self: Here the people and Moderator caused the young men to proceed to another Argument, for (said they) we understand not these things perfectly. (*d*) *Sh.* told them, that this was the Q. great principle, and therefore he pressed it so much: but yet he should propound an Argument against the eleventh Thesis about worship.

them, no less then to the soul it self: and as for this expression (what is of God, is God) it is not blasphemy, being understood of the substance of God, of which we had been speaking, and expounded it, more then the common maxime, what is in God is God. The Q. did but carp at words, when they challenged it in the Dispute, and have but dealt deceitfully in concealing our vindication of it in their account. (*a*) G. K. being challenged immediatly after the Dispute, by one of the hearers for affirming this, owned it, and promised to prove it, and some weeks thereafter confessed it to two very learned and judicious persons together, and was therefore sorry it should be omitted in their Pamphlet. Observe, that in place of their shortcomings, they have set down always perverse and dubious impertinent answers, as in place of G. K. his saying and maintaining that the manifestation is a substance, they have caused him only to say, that may be substantial, or a substance, in one respect, which in another respect is accidental, &c. p. 27. (*b*) They have set down this offer in their account, together with R. Barclays following challenge, but misplaced them, and omitted our reply to the challenge. (*c*) They have this also; but misplaced, and without our reply to it.

Section IV.

Containing the Third Argument.

§. 1. (d) R. B. read the Thesis, and *A. Sh.* articled him thus; Here ye assert, that we should not set forth to duties, till we receive a previous and sensible impulse and inspiration of the Spirit in our hearts. *G. K.* Impulse is not in the Thesis, but is an obscure word which ye impose upon us: (e) it is an Ink-horn word. *A. Sh.* (f) So are all words *Ink-horn-words*, when they are written? but I added the word *inspiration*, which may content you. But I would know whether ye extend this inspiration to all your actions, or not. *R. B.* It's only extended to all actions relating to worship. *A. Sh.* Now he is lying to you, Sirs, and contradicting *G. K.* p. 89. of his *Immediat Revelation*, hereby sayes he, it may further appear how absolutely necessary it is for a man to know the guidance of the Lord immediatly by the revelation of his Spirit, to order all the steps of his conversation, for it's not in man to direct his steps aright, and he is in all his ways to acknowledge the Lord, else he cannot do all in faith, having in all he doth either the approbation, *&c.* *G. K.* (f) Hold there, and mark how I say that he needs his command or approbation; where he was interrupted by *R. B.* And *R. B.* Let *G. K.* defend *G. K.* and for this he craves a day: ye would not defend John Meinzies, but said ye came only to dispute against the Theses: so now likewise ye must dispute against the Theses and not against *G. Keith*. *G. K.* I shall answear that at an other time (g) though thou bring *I. M.* thy master with thee. But the Students desired him to declare himself presently to the people; and *A. Sh.* (h) told, it did follow upon the Thesis, that an impulse was necessary for every thing, and they did really require an impulse for every thing, and would not pay their debt, nor

§. 1. (d) *Here we find them guilty of lieing, in that they have brought in A. Sh. speaking of particular impulses, and in that they have kept out the word, inspiration, out of his speech; lest it should appear to the world, how unjustly they carped at this word, and called it an Ink-horn word.* (e) *Which phrase (being ridiculous) they have left out, together with our reply to this challenge.* (f) *They have omitted, though it be obvious.*

(g) *They have omitted this to conceal their impertinency, envy, &c.* (h) *These words are so notour, that they could not omit all of them altogether.*

nor honour the King, except they had such an impulse, and therefore, people should be ware, to deal with them. *G.K.* Ye may bring in *Robin Hood* on the Thesis. *A. Sh.* The more absurd are they; whereupon *G. K.* offered to distinguish, adding, that it beboved him to (*i*) apologize to *R. B.* and defend his own Book. *A. Sh.* desired all to take heed to this distinction. *G.K.* (*k*) There is a twofold inspiration, mandatory, and permissive, a mandatory is, when we do any thing by command of the Spirit; and the permissive is, when we have no command for the doing or not doing of such a thing. Now I ought not to go about any action without a permissive inspiration, but I need a mandatory one for going about religious duties, and so here is no contradiction between *R. B.* and me.

§. 3. *A. Sh.* Give us a ground for that distinction out of the Scriptures. *G.K.* (*l*) Yes, I will; *Paul* essayed to go to *Bithynia*, but the Spirit permitted him not. Hence I may raise this one Doctrine, seing your Teachers will raise many more not so much to the purpose, from fewer words: I essayed to go to such a place, but the Spirit permitted me not; then God permits us sometimes to do this or the other thing, and sometimes doth not permit: for a godly man walks still in the Spirit, and hath alwayes a permissive

together, and therefore have set down some of them after the Arguments that were propounded against this Thesis. (i) *They have set this down not only where it should be, but also in the* 2. Arg. *where it should not be, and where we have spoken to it. Here likewise they have brought in* G. K. *&* R. B. *speaking vice about for a considerable time, some things that were never spoken, others* misplaced *and* perverted. (k) *To this Argument they have applyed the distinction of* general and particular inspirations, *which was really applyed to the Argument concerning inward and outward duties; and have applyed this distinction of* mandative *and* permissive inspirations *very subtilly to the Dilemma* (either he commands, or not commands) *which was really given to this Argument; for G.K. raised this distinction of* mandatory and permissive inspirations, *from these words in his Book* (having in all he doth, either the Lords command, or approbation) *which were read only here, and which he desired us to mark.*

§. 3. (l) *Here they have added a ground for permissory inspirations, out of* 1 Cor. 7. 6. compared with vers. 40. *which we shall examine afterwards.*

§. 4. (m)

missive inspiration in all his actions, though he hath a mandatory one for his religious actions only. *A. Sh.* The not permitting of *Paul*, was a command forbidding him to go, and not a permission. So ye have no ground in that Text for your distinction. *G. K.* But I gather out of these words, by the rule of contraries, that if the Spirit permitted not *Paul* at some times, it did permit him at other times. *A. Sh.* But that permission at other times, was no inspiration. *G K.* I say that it was an inspiration.

§. 4. *A. Sh.* I prove that permission is not inspiration. (*m*) God by his permissive inspiration, either he bids, or he bids not. *G. K.* It is not a sufficient enumeration, for he doth neither of them. *Andrew Thomson*, Ye know we say in such cases, *Non datur medium*. *G. K.* (*n*) There is a midle betwixt *is*, and *is not*, to wit, *not is*. *A. Sh.* then said thus, either it bids, or it does not bid: but here he got no answer. *J. L.* Such Logicks was never heard, but I impute it not to the badness of your Logick, but to your evil cause: The Q. by this shift gave to the *St.* occasion to insult over them, and also provoked the people to lightness, as they did at many other times in the Dispute.

§. 5. *J. L.* But I shall prove thus, that permission is no inspiration: if permitting be an inspiration, then inanimat things, such as a stone, can inspire, for a stone permits you. *G. K.* (*o*) There is too much Mercury in thy brain. *J. L. Henry Moir* proves that it's too much Mercury in your brains which makes you turn Quakers. *G. K.* But I distinguish yet a twofold permission, positive, and negative. *A. Sh.* What call ye positive, and negative permissions? *G. K.* (*p*) A negative permission, is

(m) *This is* misplaced *and* perverted *willingly*; *for the expres words of Mr.* Keiths *answer were* (there is a midle betwixt is, and not, to wit, not is) *which shew that he knew the Dilemma to be* (either he bids, or he bids not) *and mistook it not to be* (either he bids or forbids) *as they* falsly relate, p. 38. *neither was there any confusion or noise, till* G. K. *occasioned it by this ridiculous answer.* (n) *This answer is so notour, that it became a common proverb amongst the people.*

§. 5. (o) *Mark here* G K. *railing*, &c. *and there* passing by *the answer which shamed them.* (p) *This is* unfaithfully related *by them: For* G.K. *did not give all that answer together, nor half so clearly, as is now set down by them. Some things are denyed to* G. K. *which he did really speak, as that notour expression of his, that* (a positive permission when a Scholar comes to his Master, and sayes, *Licet exire*, Give me leave forth, and his Master sayes *Exi*, Go thy wayes forth) *which now to shun shame of it, they have bound on upon the Preses back, to shew their gratitude to him, and have brought him in* (p. 41.) *saying*, But the Master sayes, *Exi*, *to the Sob-*

is a simple forbearance, or not medling; the positive permission is, when God by some inward signification of his Spirit, in words, or otherwayes maketh us know that he alloweth us to do such a thing, although he command us not. *J. L.* How prove ye that distinction from the Scriptures? *G. K.* I shall prove it clearly by an example. *J. L.* Examples do not prove a thing clearly; for so I could prove you to have two heads, because some have been born with two heads. *A. Th.* Examples are no demonstrations. *G. K.* But they may be used to illustrate: I say then, a negative permission is when (for example) a mans servant, suppose I had a servant, and he goes away any where, without my leave, and yet I do not rebuke him for it; or when a Schollar goes out without his Masters leave, and yet his Master does not hinder him, nor rebuke him, here is a negative permission. (q) But a positive permission is, when a Schollar comes to his Master, and sayes, *Licet exire*, Give me leave forth, his Master sayes, *Exi*, Go thy wayes forth. *J. L.* (r) *Exi* is a command, and a command is a determination to one thing, and therefore is not a permission which leaves us indeterminat to both extreams, so that a command is contradistinguished from a permission. *G. K.* (s) Thou are like *J. M.* thy Master, for thou speaks more with thy fingers, then with thy tongue, and affects a canting tone. *An. Th.* The Moderator said, it's very manly and rational to demonstrat

lar, &c. Likewise between the explaining and applying of this distinction, there was a debate about the word, Exi; which being occasioned by G: K: his answer, is not very handsomly censured by Al: Sh: (q) We thought that G: K: was distinguishing permissions, which are inspirations, into negative and positive, because we were speaking of them: And if we had known before his explication and application, that he was so distinguishing all inspirations whatsomever, we had never sought such a thing from him. But mark George's ignorance, who could not explain a distinction, that is so easie and common. (r) This Argument is omitted, and in place of it, a margine is set down to us, wherein we are not much concerned our selves; but yet, to shew our gratitude to the Preses, and to justifie his Argumentation (Exi is in the Imperative mood, and therefore is rather a command then a permission) we say that the Imperative mood signifies alwayes to command, and that Eneat, is permissive only in the present tense of the Potential mood. For the generally received definition of the Imperative mood, is, Quo modo imperandum utimur, to which may be added, sæpe etiam inter fundendum & precandum, but not at all inter permittendum. (s) Observe them here both lying and railing together: But G: K: might have been silent in this, who speaks more with his hand upon his breast, then with his railing tongue. But that J: L: affected any canting tone, and that his Master had a canting tone, are manifest

demonstrat with the finger, and I am sure, that *Exi* is in the Imperative mood, and therefore rather is a command then a permission. *G: K:* No, no, will you say that every thing which is in the Imperative mood is a command. *R. B. Exi* is not a command to the Schollar, but a permission to go forth as he pleases; it's no more then *Licet tibi exire, vel exeas. A: Sh:* But apply your distinction to the matter in hand. *G: K:* I say, we ought not to do any thing by a negative permission, but we ought to have a positive permission for every thing, so that whatever we do, we should feel a positive influence of the Spirit on our hearts, prompting us out to do that, and telling us, that we may lawfully set about the same: Here there was a Pistol shot by one of the Schollars, and *G: K:* cryed out, that there may be villains there, for there are several shots already discharged; and being forbidden to fear, he answered, I am not feared, for I am ready to seal it with my blood. Presently after this he was caused to apply his distinction over again, as before. *J: L:* He hath described the positive permission to be a command. *G: K:* I say, it's no command. *J: L:* But ye described it to be a command, in that ye say it prompts you out, *&c.*

nifest lies, groundless c lumnies, perfidious breac es of the Articles, *&c. use by them to* shift the Argument; *which, with other like them, incensed and pr voked the multitude to be the black-mouthed* Shimei's.

§. 6. *A. Sh.* As I said before, (t) either God by this permissive inspiration, does bid, or does not bid, choose you. *G: K:* You would say, either bids, or forbids, and I tell thee, it does neither of them. *A: Sh:* No, I say it doth either bid, or doth not bid. *G: K:* Then I answer thee, it doth not bid. *A: Sh:* That is a strange positive inspiration and guidance of the Spirit, which doth not bid at all, nor forbid, that is a contradiction; for to inspire, is to put us out upon the doing of the thing inspired, but this putting out, cannot be fancied to be a permitting us to do what we please, without either bidding, or forbidding us; therefore neither can an inspiration be fancied a meer permission, without either bidding, or forbidding.

(t) *They have altogether* omitted *this Argument, reinstaured against this distinction: and have applyed their answer, that was really given here, to this Argument as propounded before, upon another occasion: but have yet* omitted *altogether the instances, which we gave in against this their answer.*

§. 7. *A. Sh.* (u) Ye are insisting the whole day on Imperative moods, and other Grammatications; will ye consider how this came in, for the young man asked only whether this inspiration was extended to all

(u) *There are many things o mitted here, a*

many

ll our actions, or restricted to religious actions only, and so it came not in by way of an objection against the Thesis. *A. Sh.* It might been easily framed into a formal objection: for the same reason that would infer an inspiration for religious actions, would also infer an inspiration for all our actions. *R. B.* He hath been disputing this whole day against *G. K.* Book. *A. Sh.* Is not the Doctrine the same in the Book and in the Thesis? or have I not always brought in the contradiction of your Thesis, and the absurdity that I was hinting at before, still follows on the Thesis, as yet; for *G. K.* may deny to pay his debt, or honour the King, and pretend that he hath no inspiration to do it, neither mandatory, nor permissive, negative, nor positive; he may say that his spirit will not permit him. *G. K.* We will pay our debt as well as thy self, and we refer our selves to the judgement of sober persons.

among which A. Sh. words to the people are notour; and serves to justifie the rest of our account, because we have not been so disingenuous as to conceal them; but especially of this Argument, because they shew the same to have been as long on the stage as it is in our account, and & not so short as it is in their account, wherein, after two short speeches of ours, and their answers thereto, a new Argument is propounded directly against the Thesis.

Section V.

Containing the Fourth Argument.

§. 1. *A. Sh.* (x) I prove that we need not a previous sensible inspiration for all religious actions, if we ought not to set forth to outward duties without a previous sensible influence of the Spirit, then neither ought we to go about inward duties without a previous sensible impulse of the Spirit, but the last is absurd, and therefore the first. *G. K.* I have not heard an Argument the day wherein there is more acumen; but I remember that *J. M.* thy Master did propound it to me long ago; and so albeit he is not here himself, yet he hath sent some of his stuff with thee, *Ex tua pharetra nunquam venit iste sagitta.* Whereupon the Boyes cryed out by way of derision, *Iste, iste, sagitta.* *A. Sh.* It is well known that I was forced to this Dispute at your meetings, and it is as well known that I have not spoken with Mr. *M.* since; therefore be it known

¶. 1. (x) *They have misplaced this Argument, as is clear from our preceeding Notes, and have* omitted *many things, among which is that notour saying of G. K. (J. M.* thy Master hath sent some of his stuff with thee) *which we declare solemnly to be a* gross & impudent lie.

(y)

to the whole company, that you are manifest liars. Here some of the company presently checked Mr. *Keith*, for railing and slandering Mr. M. which also they did at many other times throughout the Dispute, when they were reflecting upon the Ministers. *A. Sh.* But however answer the Argument. *G. K.* I deny the second Proposition, it's not absurd that we should not go about inward duties without an influence of the Spirit, and my reason is, because we can never suppose a man to want an influence for inward duties. *A. Sh.* We ask not thy reason. *G. K.* Thy Comorade hath said, that when we deny a Proposition, we should give a reason of our denyal. *J. L.* No, but when it's asked, and the Proposition no further proveable.

¶. 2. *A. Sh.* I shall prove the *minor* thus, if it were so we could not wait, nor desire, nor pray in our minds, except we waited a-before for this previous influence; and we would not wait a-before for that previous influence, except we waited yet for another, and so *in infinitum*. *G. K.* denyes the Sequel, because we can never suppose that a general influence of the Spirit can be wanted for these duties of waiting, desiring, fearing and loving, *&c.* of God; and the particular influences to particular duties, such as prayer, *&c.* are not wanting, when ever the season cometh for going about them.

¶. 3. *A. Sh.* If you still have that influence of the Spirit, then why do you not ofner set about duties? how can you abstain from prayer so long, and sit down to meat without saying the Grace. (y) *G. K.* I distinguish between diverse sorts of duties and influences, for some duties require a special influence; for example, Preaching and Praying are two several duties, and if I do preach with the influence I have to pray, I transgress. So I have an influence from the Spirit to wait on God when I go to meat, therefore I should seek a blessing in words, I deny the consequence, because I need another influence to speak, then to seek God in my heart: but other duties there are, for which I need only a general influence, to wit, these inward duties, and this a man can never want, and so he may set about inward duties when he pleases, seing he hath an influence already. *R. B.* To which I have this to add, it will not follow that we do not pray, nor make use of these particular influences, because at some times we take not off our Hats, and speak words, which are not essential to true prayer.

(y) *This answer is misplaced, being set down among the answers to our* 3. Arg.

¶. 4. *J. L.* What may be a *subterfuge*, and distinction for Heresies, and Hereticks, is not a good distinction for you; but this distinction of general and particular influences, may be a *subterfuge* for Heresies, and Hereticks, therefore it's not a good distinction for you. While *J. L.*

wa

was repeating the *major*, *R. B.* said, that is thy *major*, and I deny thy *minor*, be what it will. *G. K.* denyeth the *minor*, and *J. L.* proveth it thus: A Heretick may have this hereſie to forbear prayer a whole year, and guard himſelf with the Doctrine and diſtinction of general and particular influences, telling and affirming that he had not a particular influence for prayer. *G. K.* Though a Heretick may pretend ſo, yet he hath no ground from our principle to pretend to any ſuch thing; becauſe thoſe particular influences cannot poſſibly leave a man for one day. (z) *J. L.* Yet that Heretick may abſtain from prayer a whole year, and then guard himſelf with your principle, that he had no particular influence all that time; ſo a man deceitfully forbearing prayer ſo long, cannot be reproved, but muſt be thought juſt. And now, Sirs, is not this a brave ſpirit of theirs, which patronizes wickedneſs. Q. He is railing. *J. L.* I am ſpeaking the truth, and nothing like railing; but what is truth is no railing, as *G. K.* maintained in the beginning of this debate.

¶. 4. (z) *Here they have given* G. K. *the laſt word, and* kept up J. Leſlies *words, which together with their anſwer and his reply, are exceeding notour.*

¶ 5. *A. Sh.* (a) I ſay there is no ſuch thing as this general influence for inward duties at every time, and ſo the anſwer falls to the ground; we adjudge it to all preſent, if they find alwayes an influence for waiting, meditating, and deſiring, and mental praying: I appeal to *Al. Skeen* himſelf, if he find not himſelf often indiſpoſed, and wanting an influence, if he be an honeſt man, when ſome about us ſaid that we ſhould not ſpeak of his honeſty. *A. Sh.* I do not doubt of his honeſty, but I am confident he cannot deny this, if he be an honeſt man. Here *Al. Sh.* deſired the young men to be ſober and modeſt, and ſaid they were like men upon a Stage. *J. L.* Ye have ſet up Stages for us, and may we not play upon them, if we pleaſe? *A. Sh.* Will you hear an Argument for

¶ 5. (a) *They have* omitted *all the things that are contained in this Paragraph, ſome whereof are exceeding notour, in our appealing Al. Sk. to declare whether* he did find himſelf often indiſpoſed, &c. if he be an honeſt man: *other ſome declare our own infirmities. Here* J. L. *touched his neighbours, and deſired liberty to propound an Argument for the Lords Supper, as he had done once or twice before, when the Q. were put to abſurdities, and the people were calling for Arguments concerning the Sacraments: And this is it for which* (pag. 68.) *he muſt be called extravagant, who ſpake when they pleaſed, and ſought no liberty: and theſe are all the Fig-tree leaves which they have to cloak their extravagant and malicious revilings.*

for water-baptism, seing the people desire it, remitting this Argument to the judgement of the hearers. *J. L.* I shall propound an Argument for the Lords Supper. *A. Sh.* No, let Mr. *Paul* propound an Argument for Water-baptism, because the people are desirous to hear something of that.

Section VI.

Containing the Fifth Argument.

§. 1. *Paul Gellie,* (*b*) considering the multitude of common people that have come intentionally to hear us, and their earnest desire of hearing something of Gospel-ordinances, I thought good to choose this Thesis, wherein they may understand something. *R. B.* I shall read the Thesis, and having read the Thesis, *P. G.* (*c*) I cannot but challenge you in the first place in general, that the most of this Thesis, if not all that wherein you differ from other Sects and opinions, is set down in meer Scriptural expressions, like unto your Confession of Faith, only to betray the ignorant, which ought not to be so, because that in all Thesis, we should express our own opinion, since we all agree with you so far as ye speak Scripture, but differ concerning the sense of the Scripture, therefore ye ought to have expressed your mind and opinion in your own terms, or else given your sense upon the Scripture. *G K.* Thou hast our opinion in our own terms, concerning the baptism of *Infants* with water, in the last part of the Thesis.

§. 2. *P. G.* (*d*) But that is not the chief question betwixt you and us, whether *Infants* should be baptized with water, but whether any should be baptized with water, but abstracting from that this Thesis concludes Baptism with water to be ceased, or not ceased, choose you. *R. B.* It concludes it to be ceased, *P. G.* I prove then it is not ceased.

§. 1. (b) *This reason that P. G. brought for impugning this Thesis, is wholly* omitted, *and he is brought in speaking that which he did not speak.* (c) *They having nothing to answer to this general reproof, have not set it down as spoken by us, but have assigned some of it to R. B. because they had no other way to bring in the rest. An answer to their margine set down here, will be found in our Preface.*

§. 2. (d) *They have shamefully* omitted *this, and in lieu thereof brought in the St. speaking that which was spoken by none.*

(e) *If*

ceased at all, but on the contrary, that Water-baptisim is to continue (e) for ever, contrary to your meaning of the Thesis. *G. K.* O! take heed, he asserts that Baptisim with water is to continue to all eternity. *R. B.* Mark that, Clerk. *P. G.* (f) That is not my opinion; for by ever, I understand to the end of the world, or to the end of time, as in many places, both of holy Scripture and other Books, it is often taken. *G. K.* Well, prove it then.

(e) *If this be not carping at words, there is no such thing in the world; for in the Scripture* (for ever) *is taken oft for the end of the world.*
(f) *This P. G. his vindication is manked, and ascribed to the Students in general.*

§ 3. *P. G.* I prove then as *G. K.* desires, that Water-baptisim is to continue to the end of the world. Baptisim with water is to continue as long as Christs presence is to continue with his Apostles, and those that teach the Doctrine they taught, but Christs presence is to continue with his Apostles, and those that teach the Gospel he taught, to the end of the world therefore, &c. *R. B.* I deny thy *major*. *P. G.* I shal prove it out of *Matth. Chap.* 28. *vers.* 19, 20. where it is said, *Go therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe whatsoever I command you, and loe, I am with you alway even to the end of the world*: where Christ not only institutes baptisim, but asserts that it shall continue to the end of the world. *R. B.* There is no word there of Baptisim with Water, and consequently it militates nothing against the Thesis. *P. G.* I shall prove it was meant of Baptisim with water, thus. If the Apostles did practise baptisim with water after that institution, then Christs meaning is to be understood of water: but the Apostles did baptize afterwards with water, therefore Christ is to be understood as speaking concerning baptisim with water. *R. B.* I deny the *Sequela majoris*.

¶. 4. *P. G.* If the Apostles did not practise baptisim with water, in order to the obedience of Christs institution here, then it was either because they understood not Christs command, or because they had another command from Christ, choose you. *G. K.* There is a third thing, the Apostles they might have baptized with water, and yet neither been ignorant of his command, nor had a command; for the Apostles did really baptize of their own free will, in condescension to the Jews. (g) *A. Sh.* In whose authority could they do it, seing they had no command from Christ? *R. B.* By the same authority that *Paul* circumcised *Timothy*. *A. Sh.* There is no

¶. 3. ¶. 4. (g) *They have* omitted *from this to the end of this* 4. §. *where* R. B. *answer to* A. Sh. *is no-tour, and also their shameful declining to answer these two Arguments.*

parity. (h) *He*

parity. *J: L:* I offer to prove that the Apostles did not baptize out of condescension to the Jews what be stumbling block is no condescension: but baptizing in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to wit, the Trinity, is the greatest of all stumbling-blocks to the Jews, therefore no condescension to them. *R: B.* Let the young man speak for himself. Here both *G: K.* and *R: B:* refused to answer to these reasons.

¶. 5. *P. G.* I propound my reason thus: (*b*) allowing the former reasons, if the Apostles had baptized with water, out of condescension to the weak Jews, as ye say, then it should follow, at least, that baptism with water should be used amongst us, now in order to the condescension of the weak. *G: K:* (*l*) I commend the young mans *acumen* and modesty. *J: L:* You commend us alwayes when you think to get advantage to your self, but you will get none at this time. *A. Sh:* That is not the chief probation, but however we will maintain it. *R: B:* I deny the Sequel.

¶. 6. *P. G.* (*k*) I shall prove it thus: *G. K.* Here interrupted him, and said, I will give a reason out of *Augustine*. *P. G.* You bring Arguments and reasons from the Fathers against us, yet you will not suffer us to bring an Argument from them against you; seing you maintain that since the Apostles dayes to this time, there hath been a general Apostacy over the world, and consequently ye can prove nothing out of *Augustine*, according to your opinion. *G. K.* The reason is, it would also follow, that seing the Apostles did circumcise some Gentiles, in condescension to the Jews weakness, so likewise we should circumcise Christians, but we should not raise up old Ceremonies that are buried long ago. For Ceremonies are threefold, living under the Mosaical Law, dead under the Gospel, and now deadly to us Christians, as saith *Augustine*.

¶. 7. *P, G:* (*m*) There is no parity betwixt these two; for Circumcision is long ago out of use, and yet baptism with water is as much in use, & as much loved by us Christians, as ever Circumcision was by the Jews: and besides that, there is a clause annexed to baptism with water, that it should continue to the end of the world,

¶. 5. (*b*) Here they omitted the fathers allowing the former reasons, and fall upon a thing which is not so absolutely strong, though it be a sufficient argument, ad hominem, to overturn their answer. (*l*) They have omitted from this to the end of this 5. ¶. where G. K. his commendation of P. G. is notour, and confest.

¶. 6. (*k*) They have omitted the first half of this 6. ¶. (*l*) This three membered distinction is not only misplaced, being put down toward the end of the argument (whereas it comes in only here pertinently) but also drawn up in a better dress.

¶. 7. (*m*) Here they attribute P. G: his reply to the Students in general, but pervert it pitifully.

(by

world, whereas no such thing is said, nor can be said of Circumcision, since Christ himself by his coming into the world put an end to it, and therefore there is no equality, and we ought to be baptized now out of condescension, but not the Jews circumcised. *G. K.* Baptism with water is also dead and buried, and ¶ 8. *R. B.* denyed that water-baptism was to continue to the end of the world. *P. G.* I shall prove it. (n) *M. Skeen* cryed out, Will ye take heed, he hath taken upon him to prove that Baptism with water was commanded to continue to the end of the world. *P. G.* That which is instituted by Christ, and never repealed, is still binding, but baptism with water was instituted by Christ, and never repealed, therefore it is still binding, consequently endureth to the end of the world. *R. B.* I deny the *minor*. *P. G.* I prove it out of *John*, *chap.* 1. *vers.* 33. (o) Here the time appointed for the Dispute being expired, the Moderator went away, and things after that were in a great confusion. *P. G.* (p) *Christ sent me to baptize*, but according to your selves, it was *with water*: shew me then where it was repealed.

¶ 9. *G. K.* (q) Christ commanded likewise washing the feet with water, anointing the sick with oyl, and the abstaining from blood, and things strangled; neither were they yet repealed. *P. G.* That is a counter-arguing, contrary to the Articles, because it is a full Argument, and reason brought for your cause in your Thesis. *R. B.* (r) *John* must decrease, but Christ must increase. *P. G.* (s) That was meant of *Johns* honour, and not of his baptism. *P. G.* In the increase of Christs Doctrine, Miracles, and Glory, Christ commanded *John*, notwithstanding that he declined it, to baptize him with water, therefore it cannot be meant

(n) *Mr. Skeen* by leaving out the most part of what was really spoken here, and adding somethings about *John* the Baptist, which were not spoken here, but afterwards) and so bring in an answer, which was not given to it, omitting the answer that was really given.

¶ 8. (o) Here *M. Sk.* his exhortation is forgotten: and the 2. (as will be found in the Preface) have confest the omission of this argument, which adds credit also to our preceeding Animadversion. (o) They lie notoriously about the Presses removeal, for they say, pag. 47, 48. that he went away after the agitating of this Argument from Acts 10. whereas the Presse heard it not) and that no Argument was further urged; whereas hundreds can testifie, that the Dispute continued a large quarter, if not half an hour after he went away: yea, and themselves, to cloak the notorious and confest omission of this same foregoing Argument, alledged (though falsly) that it was not propounded till long after the Presse went away. (p) This is, in their narration, but misplaced, and not a proof of this minor.

¶. 9. (q) They have left out this retortion. (r) This is in their narration, but perverted and misplaced. (s) From this to the end of the 9. ¶. they have

of the repealing of *Johns* baptism, because, when Christs Gospel, according to your selves, was most flourishing, then *Johns* baptism was most practised.

§. 10. *R. B.* (t) *John* was neither a Disciple, nor an Apostle of Jesus Christ: but according to your selves, water-baptism was only commanded by Christ to his Apostles and Disciples. *P: G:* Though *John* was not an Apostle, nor Disciple, yet he was a Minister of Christ, and Christ gave testimony to his Doctrine.

§. 11. Again, (u) when Christ commanded baptism to his Apostles, he either commanded baptism with water, or with the Holy Ghost: But baptism with the Holy Ghost is now ceased, as to us, and therefore it's baptism with water. *R B.* O! Take heed how he sayes that baptism with the Holy Ghost is now ceased. *P: G:* Say only, that it is ceased, as to us, and is not administred by men. *R: B: G: K: &c.* We deny, that it's not administred by us; (x) for we baptize in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which is not with water.

§. 12. *P: G.* I shall prove from *Acts* 10: 47. that this baptism in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was with water. (y) It is said, *Can any man forbid water?* and then he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord. Yea, *Paul* was so far from arguing after this manner, that he administers baptism in this place, because they had received the Holy Ghost. *G: K:* Thou mistakes, it was *Peter*.

A. Sb.

have omitted *all*: *where adverts, that G. K. would not let J. L. add to P: G: notwithstanding that G. K. himself (not to tell more now) often added to R. B.*

§. 10. (t) *They have this also in their narration, but* misplaced and unanswered.

§ 11. (u) *This Argument is basely perverted, and assigned to the wrong person.* (x) *They have left out this, as not being able to maintain it.*

§. 12. (y) *This Argument is perverted, the strength of it concealed; and also P. G. his last reply wholly omitted, to give R. B. the last word, according to their custome.*

§. 13. (z) *Our ingenuity may be seen here; for though it be not in their account, yet we have not left out this expression,* (let every one take one) *which some will judge unhandsome. But our apologie is included in the preceeding words, and will be found set down at more length in our Preface.* (a) *They have* perverted *this Argument, and* Mr. Keiths *answer to it: after which they have subjoyned other two answers, one of* R. B. *which he spake on the Stage, but is added now, for his credits sake; and another of G. K. whereof indeed he spake some, but not in this place: And all these three answers, they have set down together, the one after the other, without any reply of ours interveening, as they have done often before. But the Auditors can testifie that they are liars; and never spake two of them, the one after the other, without a reply.* (b) *They have omitted all the rest of these Argumentations,*

A. Sh. It was *Peter* indeed, ye may look to *Acts* 10. *P. G.* It's true, it was *Peter*, yet notwithstanding my Argument remains valid. Q. It was out of condescension only. *P. G.* No such thing, for it's said, *He commanded them.*

§. 13. About this time the *St.* cryed out, Our Moderator is gone, and every one is speaking. (z) Let every one take one. *A. Sh.* (a) You cannot deny, but baptism with water, or with the Holy Ghost, is to continue to the end of the world, but dare you say, that ye give the Holy Ghost, as the Apostles did? or do you give such extraordinary gifts, as they did? Q. Though we do not give such gifts, yet we baptize with the Holy Ghost, when we, as instruments, teach men what we have immediatly by the Spirit, and so we baptize into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. *A. Sh.* (b) What sense then will ye make of the words, *Go teach all Nations, teaching them?* &c. For so ye expound baptizing to be teaching. *J. L.* Does not *Paul* contradistinguish preaching from baptizing, when he sayes, *I was sent to preach, and not to baptize.*

§. 14. (c) And so the Q. began to rail on the young men, and the Ministers; and the young men time about insulted over the Q. who exhorted them to be sober and modest, *&c.* (d) To which the young men replyed, there was no rational man who could abstain from laughing and scorning at them, if they considered their confidence in taking *tations, which were all ended a little before. P. G. Last reply, which was that* (it's said, he commanded them to be baptized, *&c.*) *for they all threw in answers about this time together, and we replyed, singuli singulis.*

§. 14. (c) *They speak nothing of their* railing *on our Ministers, and us, which is notour, and cannot with a safe conscience be denyed. We shall lay down here one expression of R. B. These are your young Ministry, and you may know by them, what stamp all the rest of your Ministers are of.* (d) *They have* omitted *this our vindication.* (e) *They have* omitted *this answer, and its reply.* (f) *They have perverted and mancked this answer.* (g) *They have* perverted *these words also, for they have made no mention of* solemn *Dispute, or our want of obligement.* (h) *They have altogether* omitted *the first part of this discourse, and basely* perverted *the second.* (i) *Mark their* sedition *here, who would have a solemn Dispute of our Religion to be given them by privat young men, and in consulto Magistratu, though it be prohibited by the Laws of the Kingdom* (k) *In place of this question, they have given to R. B. a well penn'd discourse,* (p. 48.) *which he never spake, and* omitted *our answer to what he did speak.* (l) *Here, and else where often they have brought in the Students in general speaking, to make people believe, that we spake two or three at once; which we lay to their charge upon better grounds. They have caused R. B. to say, that*

ing on the dispute, their ridiculous answers, the great loss they had been at. G. K. in name of the rest of the Q. provoked the young men to a new Dispute with them, wherein they might impugn their Religion, *per vices*. J. L. (e) They desire a new day, because they find themselves at a loss with us now. Q. Let another justifie thee, and not thine own mouth. A. Sh. (f) Ye have emboldened us so now, that we will dispute you any time, either publickly on the Streets, or in your own meeting-houses. Q. refused this, because our Ministers would not allow them to come and dispute in the Churches. P. G. (g) But to give you another solemn meeting, we are not obliged, except we had set out Theses, as you have done. Q. You have a Confession of Faith, and that's as good as Theses for you. J. L. (h) But we did not impugn your Confession of Faith; neither may we, being but young men, submit ours to a dispute without danger, seing it is established by the Laws of the Kingdom. (i) Q. cryed out, (k) Have you no other warrand for your Religion, but the Laws of the Land? A. Sh. Our Religion is established both by the Laws of God and man, but it's sufficient reason why we should not so Dispute our Confession of Faith with you, that it's authorised by King and Parliament, and all publick Dispute of it at least interdicted and forbidden to us. And holding up the Papers written in time of Dispute, she said to the Q.

(l) Ye *our present strength was all exhausted*, pag. 65. *which he said not on the Stage; and though he had, is a shameless lie.* Did not we, *the first day that we came to the meeting-house, offer to Dispute with them since the solemn Dispute, and offered to impugn any Thesis peculiar to the Q. whensoever they would. But, poor man, his strength (if we may so call it) was so exhausted in the debate, that though liberty were granted him to come to our Churches and oppose our Ministers, we think, and any rational man may think, he would shamefully refuse, and be found a vain boaster, if G. K. were to be absent from him.* (m) *They shut up all as they began, with false imputations of our promising to print the Dispute, and boasting of our own victory (an answer to which will be found in our Preface) and of laughing, clamouring, &c. which they say occasioned such a lightness and rudeness in the rabble, that they beat them off the Stage) and of not interposing ourselves to prevent and hinder the cloddering, &c. To which we answer now, that we shew the people sometimes, that the Q. were blaspheming, lying, railing, shifting our Arguments, and could not answer us; and appealed to the judicious and unprejudicat persons sometimes, but especially at the end of the whole Dispute, whether our adversaries, or we had the advantage; which, as we judge, is so far from being ostentation, that it was very rational and needful. That laughter now and then followed upon our doing this, we will not deny, it is notour,*

and

(l) Ye need not think, Gentlemen, to misrepresent us, we have the whole Dispute well written up, and may put it to the Press, before this day eight days, if we please. (m) Here the Q. railing on the young men, and their Ministers, were clodded off the Stage by some young Boyes standing by, and all the *St.* of Divinity cryed to them, and obtested them to be quiet, and let them alone; thus the Dispute ended.

and set down in our account. But that the people or we are to be blamed for that, we utterly deny (there being excepted, who perhaps have been excessive) for God has made man a risible creature, and why may he not laugh, when there is sufficient ground for it? So that if the Q. will needs blame any, it must be themselves only, who by their strange and impertinent answers, &c. occasioned all this laughter; and as for the clodding, it was occasioned not only by these, but chiefly by their railing on our Ministers; *in doing which, and giving us new provocations,* &c. *they made exceeding great noise. And as to our not interposing to prevent and hinder the rabble from beating them, but standing clamouring,* &c. *We wonder how they could be so shamefully impudent as to averr it; for we often, in the hearing of the whole Convocation, did earnestly intreat and beseech them to desist; And what more could we have done, seing the people were so many, and so inraged against them, chiefly for railing on their Ministers, that neither the strength nor counsel of them all, and us too, would have prevailed with them.*

We under-subscribers, and Disputants, do by these testifie, that this is a true Narration of the foresaid Dispute, as far as our memories can serve us. In testimony whereof, we subscribe these presents with our hands.

Pat. Sandilands.	John Watson.	*Al. Shirreff.*
Walter Robertson y.	And. Cuthbert.	*John Leslie.*
Patrick Divvie.	George Ædie.	*Paul Gellie.*
William Cochran.	John Nicol.	

So we have given the world a most true and faithful account of this Dispute sufficiently, attested by judicious and credible witnesses, confirmed by many other Arguments and evidences, that are contained in our Preface, and backed with reflections on their pretended true and faithful account of it, that are deduced from the matter, coherence, and circumstances of the same. And by these, we have evidenced, as we conceive, not only that these Q. are really guilty in a high degree of all the crimes charged upon them by us in our Remonstrance; *but also, that we and the people of our profession have yet as great ground to rejoyce and be glad of victory on our side, as we thought before: and on the other hand, that they have no reason to despise us, provoke our Ministers, and exalt themselves, as they do out of pride and self-conceit.*

The Q. Principles further confuted, and the bad tendency of them manifested to the World, both by our former Arguments, reinstaured and vindicated from their new exceptions, made against the same in their account, Apendices and Postscripts, and also by divers other demonstrations.

Section. I.

If Immediate objective Revelations be the Principal, and compleat Rule of Faith?

§. 1. THis Principle of new objective Revelations, is the head of the Monster, from which the whole body dependeth; and therefore we have judged fit to bruise the same in the first place, that, thereby, we may the more easily throw down the headless bulk afterwards. These our unreasonable adversaries, do wickedly put many indignities upon the Holy Scriptures, maliciously give out, that we are against the Spirit, and impudently vociferate, *the Spirit, the Spirit*, even as the Jews, in old, cryed out; *the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord*, so monopolising it to themselves. Wherefore we, intending to clear up matters aright, and to shew them in their own native colours, shall consider this Grand Principle in two questions. The first is, *If these revelations be the rule Faith?* And the second is, *If they be necessary for grounding true Faith?* of each of these questions, we shall first unfold the true state, and then impugne their impious Tenets; and the first of them, we are to handle in this first Section, which, for the more clearness, we subdivide, as followeth, into three parts.

Sub-

Sub-Section.

The state of the Question opened up, and these Revelations proved, not to be the foresaid rule of Faith.

§. 2. First of all then, for opening up the genuin state of the Question, let it be marked, that both parties, by *Faith*, here understand, *a true Divine Saving Faith*, and not a Historical, or Dogmatical Faith only. 2. By the principal and compleat rule of Faith here, is to be understood, the chief and Adequat Standard or Measure, by which, we are to judge of all the Articles of Religion, or material objects of Faith: so that, what ever is not warranted by, and agreeable to that Standard or Measure, is to be rejected as no point of our Faith; or that which is sufficient for the begetting of Faith. *In genere causæ exemplaris & directivæ secundum quam credere debemus*, and not (as we fear Q. do take it) for the begetting of Faith, *in omni genere causæ*: For so diverse questions should be confounded together, *viz. What is the efficient cause of Faith, or begetter of it? What is the material Object*, or that which we believe (*propter aliud*) because of some other thing, and by which we answer the question, *what believe ye? What is the formal object of Faith*, or that which is not believed for any other thing, but is the principal reason and motive, for which, we do believe all the material Objects of Faith, and by which, we most usually, and with the greatest satisfaction answer the question, *why believe ye?* and unto which we do ultimately resolve our Faith. We say that the Spirit of God is the efficient cause of Faith, and begetteth it by Inlightning the Understanding, and Inclining the Will, no less then Q. And so we assert *a necessity of Divine, Supernatural Illumination and Grace*. Yea, we say, that this efficacy of the Spirit is insuperable, and cannot be defeated, by us according to our pleasure, which the Q. will not say: so that, although we deny immediate objective Revelations to be the chief rule or necessary, yet we are more for the Spirit, *sans sensu*, then the Q. themselves. Most of our Divines hold the formal object of Faith to be a compound of the Veracity, and scriptural Revelation of God: And others judge it to consist solely, and intirely in the Veracity of God alone; adding, that Scriptural Revelation is the principal mean, by which the Veracity of God is applyed to all the material Objects, or particular Articles of Faith; and so only differing a little from the former Divines, as it seems to us in the matter of a School question. But all of them agree in this, that the Scripture is the principal, compleat and infallible rule of Faith.

§. 3. Thirdly, here the Spirit of God considered abstractedly from Revelation

velations, cannot be understood (for abstracting from Revelation, he doth not at all direct us to our duty, or rule us) but it must be the Spirit of God revealing, and manifesting such things to us. So that the question is, If the Revelations of the Spirit, be such a rule, rather then, if the Spirit of God be such a rule. Now 1. These are not subjective Revelations, or Divine Illuminations; for who will say, that these are the chief rule, seing they are no other thing, but the meer inlightning, disposing and qualifying of the mind? Neither 2. Are they the Law of Nature, or dictates of reason, which are given mediatly by the Spirit, in the natures of things, and, though they may be called a rule of manners, in some things; yet they are not a compleat rule of Faith and Manners sufficient to bring men to Heaven. Neither 3. Are they mediat objective Scriptural Revelations, or the Spirits proponing the Articles of Faith in the Scriptures; for we own such; and it hath been often demonstrated by our Divines, that the Scripture is the Word of God; the denyal whereof, hath been often charged upon our Adversaries. But they are supernatural, immediate, objective Revelations.

§. 4. Observe, that the question proceeds about the principal rule, which is to be distinguished from other subordinate rules: for in a large sense, many other rules of Faith there be; but so, as they are to be reduced to, and examined by the Scriptures, which are the principal Rule. Lastly, mark, that the question is not, if some extraordinary new objective revelations (which may be possibly given by the Spirit of God to some particular persons, in some extraordinary cases) be a rule to them in these cases, and about these things, that are thus revealed; for we say the same also. But the question is about the permanent and ordinary Rule; and may be stated thus, *whether the supernatural, inward, immediate, new, objective revelations of the Spirit of God, distinct and extrinsick from the Holy Scriptures, be the permanent and ordinary, principal, compleat and infallible rule of Faith, by which all ought to judge and examine all the material objects of Faith, and Articles of Religion, yea or not?* The Q. maintain the affirmative part, we hold the negative and prove it thus.

§. 5. Argument 1. all men have not such revelations and Enthusiasms as in the state of the question hath been described; and therefore, they are not such a principal and compleat rule of Faith, as hath been there described. So we argue very lawfully against the Q. For, though we make the Scripture their rule only, who have the Scriptures revealed to them, yet Q. make these Enthusiastical revelations, all and every mans rule. The consequence is clear; for these revelations cannot be such a rule to them, who have them not. We prove the antecedent thus:

Hea-

Heathens and Pagans, who have not heard of Christ, or his Gospel, have not such revelations. For 1. they are said, (*Isa.* 9. 2. and *Mat.* 4. 16.) *to walk in darkness, and dwell in the shadow of death*; and (*Prov.* 29. 18.) they are supposed to perish for want of vision: and (*Psal.* 147. 19, 20.) it is said, *that God sheweth not his words unto them*, as he had done unto Israel; where Israel being opposed to other Nations, is to be taken for the Nation and people of the Jews: and (*Col.* 1. 26.) the Gospel preached to the Gentiles, is called *a mystery which had been hid from ages, and from generations*, but then *made manifest to the Saints*: *To whom God would make known, what is the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ among you, the hope of glory; whom we preach* &c. *Christ among you*, Colossians, we say, for so the preposition, ἐν, is often expounded, as *Luk.* 1. 28. *Rom.* 15. 9. 1 *Cor.* 5. 4. and ought so to be rendred here, as we conceive, and not we only, but *Beza, Piscator*, , the *Dutch Divines*, and many others of the most judicious interpreters on the place, neither is it without ground, for the Apostle is speaking of the outward preaching of Christ, among the Colossians and other Gentiles, and accordingly, Translators and Interpreters, generally render the words, ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, among the Gentiles, which immediatly preceed, and are exactly like unto these: so that the sense is, that God would make known what is the glory of this mystery of Christ preached among them, which was unto them a door of hope. Yea, and though the place were to be Interpreted, *Christ in you*, it would make nothing for the Q. for it were to be understood of Christ working inwardly in them, by inlightning and changing the will, and received of them by a true Faith: but not of Christ revealing in them the articles of Faith immediatly. It is true indeed, that many, now among us, who have the Scriptures, are in darkness, because they take not heed to them, or reject them; but these were in darkness for want of objective revelation; for Christ and his Gospel were not revealed to them, as may be gathered from the contexts of these places. For in *Isa.* and *Mat.* the darkness is opposed to the objective revelation and preaching of the Gospel by Christ, and the people are said to have seen a great Light, which Light cannot be the meer disposing of the mind; for who will say that all were well disposed, who saw this Light, and if it be immediate revelation, they wanted the same before: but if they say it was the outward preaching of the Word we have our intent, who affert the same with the Scripture, which sayeth that Christ came & dwelt in *Capernaum*, that the prophecy of this peoples seeing a great Light, might be fulfilled. The like might be shown of the other places, but it is so obvious, that they speak of want of objective revelation, that we need not insist thereon. *Secondly*, Outward apparitions were gi-

ven

ven only to some amongst the Jews at some times, which is evident from 1 *Sam.* 3. 20. *Jer.* 31. 1, *&c.* and the revelations, in and by the seed, were (according to *G. K.* own acknowledgement in his *Immediate Revelation*, p. 11.) *more rare and less known under the Law, the seed not being compleatly formed*, &c. So that no Enthusiastical revelations, were the Jews principal and compleat rule in old. And who will say, that the Heathens and Pagans have a greater measure of these revelations, or have a clearer rule, or in a better condition now, then the beloved people of the Jews in old; yea, then even the Gentiles were, who had the Law of Nature, and a natural conscience, no less then these Heathens have now? In the mean time we add to this Argument these few, but pertinent *queries*, what is *Conscience*, and what is *Reason*, according to you? What mean you by the *Law of old nature*, and what by the *Law of new nature*, mentioned by *R. B.* in his *Calumnies*? p. 23. Which of them, say ye, doth *Pelagius* exalt too much? How far the boundaries and limets of each of them are stretched forth; and why they go so far, and no further, according to you? How are the *Conscience* and *Reason* distinguished from the light within, and the dictates of them from these revelations, according to your Hypothesis.

Arg. 2. But suppose that these Heathens and Pagans had such revelations about some things, yet they should not be their compleat rule; for they do not discover any means sufficient to prevail to sanctifie souls, nor how God can be reconciled with men, and yet the ends of his Government be attained; They do not reveal how the justice of God may be satisfied for sin, nor who can satisfie for it, so as men may be saved; They do not shew that God will save man by a Redeemer, nor how that Mediator can die for us, and deliver us from death, and bring us to Heaven; Nor do they make known what may be a fit condition, or what condition God doth require of us, that we may have redemption by that Saviour: Much less do they reveal the *Incarnation*, Passion, Resurrection, *&c.* of Jesus Christ the Son of God, and born of the Virgin *Mary*; and the Doctrine of believing in him, We know Q. maintain both against them who are called *Contra-Remonstrants*, and also against *Arminian-Remonstrants*, that the outward transactions of Christ are not necessary to be known by these *Heathens* and *Pagans*, in order to the obtaining of Salvation. But first of all, the necessity of knowing these same outward transactions, may be proved from these Scriptures, *Isai.* 53. 11. *By his knowledge shall my righteous Servant justifie many.* Act. 4. 12. *There is no name given under Heaven by which we can be saved, but by the Name of Jesus Christ.* In which places indeed a notional head-knowledge, or meer outward declaration cannot be understood, for it cannot justifie; but a knowledge, which, though it be grou-

ded

ded on outward mediate revelation, yet it self is an obediential, inward heart-knowledge of Christ and his outward meritorious transactions, 1 *Cor.* 2. 2. *I determined to know nothing among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified*, that is to say, as appears from the Context at the very first view, I resolved, that I *Paul* should not preach, make shew of, or promove any other knowledge among you *Corinthians*, but the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and his outward meritorious crucifixion, and other transactions: and not (as *R.B.* wrests the words, *p.* 14. of his *W.M. unmasked*) I rejoyce that ye *Corinthians* know Christ, as inwardly crucified a-fresh in your selves, and I do prefer it to all other knowledge.

§. 7. But secondly, without the knowledge of Christs blood and outward sufferings, they could not believe, which may be proved from the nature and inseparable adjuncts of faith: for how could they assent to the things that they knew not? How could they accept of Jesus Christ for their only Lord and Saviour, apply the plaister of his blood to their souls, and rely upon him for their salvation, while they are altogether ignorant of the same? They could not have faith then, we say, which is appointed an indispensible condition of interest in Christ, and mean of Salvation, according to these Scriptures, *Joh.* 3. 36. *Heb.* 11. 6. *Joh.* 8. 24. *Rom.* 9 6. *Joh.* 1. 12. *Psal.* 2. 12, &c. Yea, the necessity of Faith is so evidently asserted in the Scripture, that the Q. cannot deny it; and therefore, (*p.* 21. of *their truth cleared of calumnies*) they answer, that faith may be without the knowledge, assent, acceptance of, and relyance on Christ, as appearing in *Judea*, and suffering there outwardly, but not without the knowledge, *&c.* of the inward blood and sufferings, so recurring to an heavenly and spiritual nature in Christ, which is distinct from the God-head on the one hand, and from the man-hood on the other. As for this, we are to shew afterwards at large, that there is no such inward blood, nor heavenly and spiritual third nature in Christ. But, suppose there were such a thing, we prove here, that these Heathens could not by other ordinary means believe without the knowledge of Christs outward sufferings: If outward hearing of the outward Word be required as a necessary ordinary mean for begetting of faith, then the knowledge of the outward sufferings is also required thereto, and the knowledge of the inward and spiritual blood-shed is not sufficient. But the first is true, *ergo*. It follows clearly; for the inward blood-shed is only known and felt, within immediatly and independently from outward hearing; and the *minor* is as clear from *Rom.* 10. 14. *How shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard.* And *vers.* 17. *Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God.* Where the Apostle doth not speak of any inward Enthusiastical hearing, or word, but of the outward;

for that word is such, as is preached by many Preachers in the plural number, that are sent, and have beautiful feet, such as were *Moses* and *Isaias* instanced in the place: nor doth he include all persons whatsomever; for he limits the assertions to them that are capable of hearing, such as doubtless all the Heathens are, except Infants and deaf persons: Nor is it to be understood of any extraordinary way of begetting faith, but of the ordinary means, for he would never have denyed that faith could be produced by God extraordinarily, without the outward hearing of the Word. Moreover, if the Doctrines of the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of Christ, &c. were not necessary to be known, then there should be no necessity of Christianity, as we are to shew at more length afterwards. Here we add this *querie*, as being very seasonable, wherein consists the nature and essence of faith, according to Q. It's true that the Heathens will not be condemned for not knowing, or not obeying the things which were never promulgat to them; yet it's as true, that they will be condemned for their other sins, against which, the knowledge of Christ, and his outward meritorious transactions, and believing in him, are the necessary antidote and ordinary means. But last of all, we argue not from this precisely, that these revelations do not reveal Christ and his outward transactions; but also from that they do not reveal many other things, that are indispensably necessary: so that our Argument holds, though the knowledge of Christ and his outward transactions were not necessary to these Heathens, in order to the obtaining of their salvation.

§. 8. *Arg.* 3. That men might believe, and be saved, God hath made the Scriptures and outward revelations of the Articles of Faith, necessar ordinary means; and therefore, these Enthusiasms are not the most compleat, clear and chief rule. The sequel is evident; for if these Enthusiasms be the most compleat, clear and chief rule, and on the other hand, the Scriptures and outward revelations more imperfect, dim, and inferior to them, then it should not be necessary at all, that the Articles of Faith already propounded by these Enthusiasms, should be revealed over again by the Scriptures and outward revelations; yea, not so much as necessary *secundum quid*, or profitable: We illustrat it by this example, he that hath an intire new Book, of a clear and big Letter, needeth not a mutilated and dim Copy of that same Book. He indeed, who hath these Books, may perhaps alledge, that he needs the old to preserve the new; But will the Q. say that they need the Scriptures to spare their revelations. The antecedent is proved by these three most luculent Scriptures, *Acts* 13. 46. *It was necessary that the Word of God should be first spoken to you.* Joh. 20. 31. *But these things are written that ye might believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believ-*

ing, ye might have life through his Name. Where the Evangelist S. *John* resounds salvation upon believing, and believing on written revelations, *Rom.* 10. 14. *How shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard?* Where S. *Paul* makes hearing needful to believing; and that it's outward hearing, we have proved already, §. 7. The Apostle interrogats how they could, in an ordinary way, believe without hearing, and how they could hear without a Preacher, and how they could Preach, except they were sent, and consequently, how they could hear and believe, without outward Preaching? Insinuating thereby a strong negation. But these *new Apostles*, assuming to themselves greater knowledge, and further revelations, may tell him roundly, that they can believe, without such hearing and preaching, by the help of immediat revelation, as the better ordinary mean.

§. 9. *Arg.* 4. That which discovers not lust or concupiscence, and sundry other sins to be sins, Is not a compleat rule: But such are these revelations, *ergo*, The *major* needs no proof, the *minor* we prove from *Rom.* 7. 7: *Nay, I had not known sin, but by the Law, for I had not known lust, except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet.* Where the Apostle declares plainly, that he would never have known the rises and first motion of lust and covetousness, in the heart to be sin, by these immediat revelations, or any other ordinary way, if the Law had not said, *Thou shalt not covet.* The Q. we know, will answer, that this was the inward Law, and not any thing distinct from these revelations. But they who read the foregoing & following verses, may judge if this be true, or the Apostle is meaning only the mediate Law. For, *vers.* 4. if he sayes, *That we are dead to that Law, by the body of Jesus Christ.* And *vers.* 6. *We are delivered from that Law* (to wit, as to the co-active, irritating and condemning power thereof.) Which verses are necessarily conjoyned with this 7th. *vers.* But are the Q. dead to their inward Law, and their immediat revelations? We do not expect that the Q. will say so themselves. But it is like others will say it of them, who know their lust and covetousness to be so great.

§. 10. *Arg.* 5. Either the Jews under the Law had these Enthusiastical revelations, for their principal and compleat rule, yea, or not? Our *Adversaries* cannot say the first, for *G. K.* in his Book of *Immed. Revel.* which is approved and owned by all of them, teaches, *p.* 11. 49, 50. that these revelations were *more rare, and less known under the Law, the seed not being compleatly formed*, &c. and that *the main and principal difference betwixt the Law and the Gospel, the Old Covenant and the New, lieth in this, that the ministration of the Law was outward and mediate, and it had an outward Law (or rule) and the ministration of the Gospel is the ministration of the Spirit more immediatly speak-*

ing to us, &c. Neither can they say the second, seing the chiefest, if not all the reasons, brought by them to prove, that these revelations are our principal and compleat rule now, do equally prove, such revelations to have been a principal and compleat rule to the Jews under the *Law*, as may be seen in their Pamphlets, and likewise the Scriptures cited by them for that end, for example, *Joh.* 1 9. *Christ the true light inlighteneth every man.* 1 *Cor.* 12 7. *A manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal*: which (according to them) speak of all and every man whatsoever, without exception; and we believe the Jews were men under the Law, as well as ℣ are now. Yea, further, these reasons and Scriptures doth as solidly prove such revelations to have been a principal and compleat rule to the Gentiles before Christs Incarnation, (not to speak of the Heathens since that time) as to be ours now; for they are men likewise: and this is not only to prefer the Gentiles in the matter of *Church-priviledges* to the Jews, who (according to *G. K.* sentiment in the fore-cited places) had nothing but the outward ministration of the Law, except some rare and few revelations; but also directly to contradict the Spirit of God in the places of Scripture cited §. 5.

§. 11. *Arg* 6. If all men had such immediat objective revelations, then all men would be Prophets: But so it is, that all men are not Prophets; and therefore all men have not such immediat objective revelations; and consequently, these are not the foresaid rule. The sequel of the *major* is clear from the nature and essence of a Prophet, as such, which consists not precisely in the knowing or fore-telling things to come, but in having immediat objective revelations whatsoever from God. For *Moses* acted the part of a Prophet in writing the Book of *Genesis*, which contains things past long before his time; *Elijah* and *Elisha*, &c. were Prophets, in discovering things of their own present time; and they were Prophets who in the Church of *Corinth*, for a season had immediatly revealed to them the Doctrines of Faith and Manners, that are ordinarily taught now by Pastors out of the Scriptures, and serve for the *edification* and *exhortation* and *comfort* of the Church; so that the Prophets had nothing peculiar to them only, and common to them all, but only the having of immediat objective revelations. We cannot so much as conjecture, what our adversaries can say here, except it be that teaching by the Spirit is peculiar to the Prophets as such. But this were only to juggle; for, according to them, Pastors and Teachers teach by the Spirit, no less then Prophets. We have likewise very luculent proofs of our *minor*, in 1 *Cor.* 12. *viz.* that all men are not Prophets: For in the 28. *vers.* the Apostle saith expressly, that *God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, 2ly Pro-*

phets,

phets, 3ly *Teachers*. And v. 29. subjoyns these Questions, *Are all Apostles? Are all Prophets? Are all Teachers?* Which are equivalent to as many strong negations. And in the foregoing part of the Chapter, he shews from the necessity of diverse members in the natural body, the necessity of distributing diverse gifts to diverse persons, and not the same to all the gifted *Corinthians*, and consequently the necessity of not giving Prophesie to all. But we shall shut up this Argument with these *Queries*, *What is Prophesie?* and, *How are Prophets distinguished from Apostles and Teachers?* and so proceed to

§. 12. *Arg.* 7. All men have not the Spirit, *Jude v.* 19. therefore, all men have not immediat objective revelations. Here it would be noted, that there is a vast difference betwixt this *Quaker*-controversie and the *Arminian*-controversie about sufficient grace in all men; for *Arminians* say only that all men have sufficient objective grace, given them mediatly in the *Scriptures*, *Law of Nature*, and *Works of Providence*, and a sufficient subjective grace, which consists in the illuminating the understanding, and inclining the will sufficiently; But the *Q.* say, that all men have immediat objective revelations. The Argument would seem to ingenious persons to be beyond exception; But what will not *Q.* snarle at, rather then renounce their errours? *R. B.* (*p.* 18. of his Book of *Calumnies*) answers, that, *there may be a sufficient light in men, who may be said after a certain manner not to have the Spirit, as being such who resist his drawings: In which resistance of the Spirit, they who continue until the day of Gods visitation unto them come to an end, they have not the Spirit of God so much, as to invite and call them unto God*, or to give them the least tender of his love. Where 1. He directly contradicts the Text, for he saith, that some have sufficient revelations, though they resist them, and be not in union with the Spirit; whereas the Text saith simply that *they have not the Spirit.* 2. He grants all that we seek (so strong is the evidence of truth, that it often extorts an assent from its fiercest adversaries, against their wills.) For he confesseth that some have not these revelations, nor the *least tender of Gods love*, viz. *they whose day of visitation is come to an end.* We argue therefore thus, If immediat objective revelations were the principal and compleat rule, then they who have sinned the sin against the Holy Ghost, and all they whose day of visitation is come to an end, do not sin at all, nor can sin. But this is absurd, *ergo*, the *minor* cannot be denyed: and the sequel is proved thus; They who are not obliged to any thing, neither do, nor can sin, because, where there is no obligation, there can be no sin. But they should not be obliged to any thing, *ergo*, the *minor* only remains to be proved, which we endeavour thus: They who have not a rule (or Law) are

not

not obliged to any thing: But they ſhould have no rule, *Ergo*. The *Major* ſtands immoveable on its own bottom. And the *Minor* is no leſſe firm. For theſe revelations they have not, as is granted; and the Scriptures are not a rule, nor obliedge without theſe revelations, according to Q. which if they did, they ſhould be a principal rule contrary to Q.

Sub-section, 2.

Concerning the evidence of theſe Revelations.

§. 13. *Arg.* 8. WE ought not to believe theſe Revelations (or the Spirit, as the Q. love to ſpeak) for our principal and compleat rule (or to be ſuch a rule) of Faith; and therefore, they are not ſuch a rule. The *Sequel* is evident. We prove the Antecedent thus. We ought not to believe, that we our ſelves, or any other in the World, beſides pretended *Enthuſiaſts*, have ſuch Revelations; neither ought we to believe *Enthuſiaſts* to be inſpired, and led by the Spirit, or hearken to them, pretending to ſuch Revelations. And therefore, we ought not at all to believe ſuch Revelations, for our principal and compleat rule of Faith. This was the Medium, which we uſed on the Stage, as may be ſeen in our *account*, and ſo we deſcended a *Theſi ad hypotheſin*, and not thus, *ſuch as affirm the Spirit to be the principal rule, cannot give any evidence, to convince their oppoſers, that they are led by it*; and therefore *it is not the rule*, as *R. B.* falſly alledgeth us to have argued, *pag:* 62. Now this inference is manifeſt, and the antecedent hath two parts, which, for the more clearneſs, we ſhall handle ſeverally. As for the firſt, to which our adverſaries adventured not to anſwer in the Diſpute.

§. 14 We ought not to believe that any ſuch revelations are made to our ſelves, or any others in the World, except pretended *Enthuſiaſts*, becauſe, neither they, nor we have any ſuch revelations, or know the Articles of Faith to be revealed over again immediatly in our ſelves. For proof whereof, it might ſuffice us to refer the reader to the Arguments already ſet down, §. 5, 11, 12. *&c.* But notwithſtanding of them, we argue thus. If God did give immediate objective revelations into our hearts; then, ſurely he would propone and hold forth unto us ſome ſufficient objective evidences (marks and characters of them) ſuch as he gave in old to the Patriarchs, Prophets and the Apoſtles of the immediate objective revelations made

to

to them, and such as he holds forth unto us now of the mediate objective revelations in the Scriptures. But he doth not this; Ergo, as to the Sequel of the major, God might indeed deny a subjective evidence, or disposition of the mind to believe the things, that he reveals immediatly, it being our duty to be well disposed, and our fault that we are not so; even as he doth often deny a subjective evidence of Scriptural revelations now. In which cases, if we were deceived, and mistook, or perverted those revelations, whether immediat or Scriptural, we should not be deceived by them, which alwayes carry along a sufficient objective evidence in them wherever they come, nor have them, or the Spirit, who is the author of them, to blame, but our own ignorance & wickedness; for the defect should not be *ex parte objecti revelati vel spiritus revelantis*, but *ex parte subjecti, facultatis scil. cui objectum satis evidenter proponitur*. But God would not withhold (we say) sufficient objective evidence of these immediate objective revelations, or a perspicuity and clearness in them, whereby they may be known, and when they meet with well disposed faculties, they are, *de facto*, discerned from the suggestions of the Devil, and imaginations of the heart. We might multiply reasons of this: for doth not God deal with us as with rational men? seeks he a groundless and blind Faith from us, or doth he oblidge us to obey these as our principal rule, whereof, we have not a sufficient evidence propounded to us, what or whence they are? Doth God expose us inevitably to deception and erring, or causes he us to sin by denying that, which is his part to give? All which he would certainly do, and likewise come short of his end, in giving such immediate objective revelations, (*viz.* to be the principal rule of Faith) if he gave not a sufficient objective evidence with them, and, which is horrid, were he not to be blamed, termed uncertain, &c.

§. 15. So the Sequel is secured, and we come to the *minor, viz.* that God doth not give us any such objective evidences of any immediate objective revelations. For proof hereof, we know no such thing our selves, and appeal to the common experience and testimony of all mankind, if they have any such evidences of such revelations made unto them: whose declaration is most credible. Is not the existence of a Deity, and many other things solidly proven, by the consent of all nations; and is not their consent and testimony of as great weight here? Seing all men have these revelations given them to be their chief rule, and also these revelations are self evident to Q. Can a thing that is self evident, be hidd from the whole World, except a few *Illuminado's*? Or how can we know any thing, if we cannot discern

ſcern revelations, which are ſelf-evident, and ſo egerly propounded to us by theſe people? Are there not many rational, and indifferent perſons, beſides them, yea, and many real ſaints, who know no ſuch evidences of objective, immediate revelations in them? Is there any other ſelf-evident thing in the World, beſides theſe revelations, which none but a few *Enthuſiaſts* doth perceive? But why inſiſt we on generals? Let us inſtance ſome particular Articles of Faith, and ſee if they be ſelf-evident. *The Word was made fleſh, Chriſt died for our ſins, and did riſe again for our righteouſneſs*, are Articles of Faith; But is it evident, that theſe are revealed immediatly to us? Or are theſe doctrines evidently true of themſelves? Can ſufficient proof be brought for them from themſelves, or from other more evident revelations? are they not ſo far from being ſelf-evident, that the World cannot know them, even as to the ὅτι, without divine revelations; yea, and can never diſcern a way how they can be, theſe objects are ſo high and ſublime in themſelves, and the Gentiles accounted them folly, when they were firſt propounded to them, becauſe they are ſo inevident? We might inſtance many other Articles, and appeal to the World, if they have objective evidences of them, either that they are revealed to them immediatly, or are true in themſelves. In the mean time, let our Adverſaries remember, that the negative part only is ours, and the affirmative theirs. We need not tell them, what follows; for it cannot be ſuppoſed, that they are ignorant of the common Maxime, *affirmanti incumbit probatio.* But we add for caution, that we ſay not, the Spirit, or objective revelations wants ſufficient objective evidences; yea, we aſſert, that the one of them cannot be without the other, and hence infers, that we ought not to believe, that we have ſuch revelations, which was the firſt part of our Antecedent; becauſe we have not ſuch evidences of them. Can this be retorted on the Scriptures? Not at all; for have not our Divines demonſtrated that we have the Scriptures of God, and that the Scriptures have objective evidences in themſelves, both of their Divine Authority, and alſo of the true ſenſe?

§. 16. Now we proceed to the other part of our antecedent, to wit, that we ought not to believe the *Quakers* or other *Enthuſiaſts* to be ſo inſpired, and led by the Spirit, nor hearken to them pretending ſuch revelations: which was the thing moſt inſiſted on, in our Argument firſt propounded on the Stage, and is proved, becauſe they cannot give any ſufficient evidence, that they have any revelations at all, much leſs that they have ſuch particular revelations, and far leſs yet, that they are led by them; for theſe revelations, according to them, may be ſlighted. Here we mean not an evidence, which will actual-

ly,

ly, and *de facto*, convince a pertinacious adversary, but an objective evidence, or clearness in the thing it self, which is, *aptâ natâ*, fit of its own nature to convince, and will really convince the well disposed: Neither mean we any evidence, to which Heretiks cannot pretend; for they can, and do pretend to the very Scriptures themselves; but an evidence that is not really verified of them, may not be justly pretended to by them. Now this inference is manifest; for either they can assign us an evidence of these revelations, or not? If they cannot, why do they desire us to believe them? May not men be, and have not many been deceived by a seducing spirit, thinking it to be the Spirit of God: ought we then to believe revelations without an evidence, which is to give an implicite faith to every wind of Doctrine? But if they can assign such an evidence, we are ready to hear them. True it is, our adversaries are exceeding loath to produce their *credentials*, and use all the methods they can to shift us; wherein coming short of their design, they labour desperatly to obtrude upon us insufficient evidences; but while they shun the ditch, they fall into the mire, for by doing so, they cause themselves to be taken for cheats and deceivers.

§ 17. Here first of all occurrs to us that retortion, which *R. B.* gave in the Dispute, and it is, that our most Learned and Reverend Professor, Mr. *John Menzies* would not assign Jesuite *Dempster* a ground to prove the truth of the *Protestants Religion*, but alledged that he ought to prove, it had no such ground; and therefore, they were not obliged to give us an evidence of the Spirit in them, *&c.* But for *Answer*, it is well known that *R. B.* was brought up in a Popish College, and it is thought by many that he is a Jesuited Emissary, which we are the rather induced to believe of him, because his practices agree so exactly with the Jesuites *Morals*, and here in particular, he gives an egregious *specimen* of his Jesuitical *honesty*, in saying that our *Professor* would not assign the *Jesuite* a ground to prove the *Protestants Religion*: which is a most palpable lie, confirmed by as many clear evidences as there are Copies of these Papers extant; in the very 5. *Pag.* whereof, one ground is given in; and *Pag.* 47, 48, *&c.* two are produced and improved at large, whereas the *Jesuite* sought but one. Mr. *Menzies* indeed put his adversary to it very often, and dared him to instance any ground of the *true Religion* which agrees not to ours (see *pag.* 9. 19, 67, 27, *&c.*) and that not without sufficient grounds; for so the *Jesuite* should have assigned a reciprocal ground of the *true Religion*, from which our *Professor* (who never intended, as is evident from Epist. *Dedicat.* of *Papismus Lucifugus*, and from the Papers themselves, *Pag.* 19. and from *Roma Mendax*, *Pag.* 19. to be meer defendant,

dant, but also to retaliate and argue as he should see fit:) From which reciprocal ground, we say, he might have impugned the *Jesuite* afterward. Yea, further, he shews by irrefragable reasons, that Mr. *Dempster* was oblidged to prove his assumption; neither see we the least shadow of reason, for the *Jesuites* plea; seing he asserts, that all the three propositions of his often repeated Syllogism are affirmative, *pag.* 59. 77. and his *Ghost* maintains, in his Book of *Scolding*, *p.* 28. — that the assumption is affirmative: But *ex altera parte*, are the Q. to impugn us vice-about? or say we, that our proposition is affirmative? Did not we produce one pretended evidence of theirs, which they owned on the Stage, and endeavoured to defend, to wit, their own declaration of having the Spirit of God, which so solved their retortion in the Dispute, that they were no more able to sustain it; and how could we know any other evidences, to which these *novices* can lay claim? seing they suspend the Scriptures testimony upon the Spirits immediat revelations.

§. 18. We have spoken enough to this shift, now follows another *retortion*, which is prosecuted by *R. B. p.* 58, 59, *&c.* and it is, that we have no certain evidence, by which we can make known, that we are led by the Scriptures, which they cannot assume, as to the Spirit; and many men have been, and are deceived by a seducing spirit, thinking it to be the Spirit of God; and none of these diverse Sects, who all make the Scriptures their principal rule, pretending to be led by them, and denying it of others, can give any certain evidence that they are led by them, more then they who affirm the Spirit to be the principal rule, can give any evidence to convince their oppolers, that they are led by it. Whence he concludes, that, if from these reasons it would follow, that the Spirit of God is not the rule, deceives people, or is to be blamed, *&c.* then from these same reasons it would follow, that the Scriptures are not the rule. But 2ly, Doth the retortion meet with the Argument as propounded by us, or by any others of our Religion? Do we conclude that the Spirit is not the rule of Faith, because men may be deceived by a seducing spirit, and Enthusiasts contradict one another, and some among them contradict themselves, or because they cannot give an evidence, which will actually convince that they are led by these Enthusiasts or by the Spirit, as Q. love to speak? No such thing: for, supposing that we had such Enthusiasms given us to be our rule of Faith, these things might fall out for want of a subjective evidence or disposition of mind. But our Argument proceeds about a sufficient objective evidence and proof that they have such revelations, or are led by them: and hence we conclude, that we ought not to believe them, *&c.* And if they will have

the

the retortion to meet with us, it must be formed after this manner; They who make the Scripture their principal rule, cannot give any objective evidence and proof that they have the Scriptures from God, and give the true sense of them, and are led by them, sufficient to convince their respective oppoſers; therefore, if upon this accompt, we ought not to believe Q. to have such revelations, and to be so led by the *Spirit*, nor hearken to them pretending such revelations, then neither ought we to believe, that they who make the Scriptures their principal rule, have the *Scriptures* of God, or give the true senses of them, nor hearken to them imposing such senses upon the Scriptures. Now the solution is easie; for they who make the Scriptures their principal rule, are either our Churches, or they are Sects dissenting from us? If the *first*, have not our *Divines* frequently proved, both from the intrinsick characters of Divinity that appear in the Scriptures themselves, and also from the outward motives of credibility, that we have these Scriptural revelations from God? And have they not often assigned sufficient objective evidences and proofs of the senses of the Scriptures, taught by our Churches, as to every point controverted betwixt us and all Sects whatsoever: so that dissenters remain unconvinced only for want of subjective evidence, and disposition of mind, and really ought to believe us teaching such senses of Scripture. If they be Sects differing from us, we freely grant, that they cannot assign any sufficient objective evidence of the senses imposed in Scripture by them, in so far as they differ from our Churches; and so we ought not to believe them imposing such senses on Scripture. But, as for Q. they cannot assign us any sufficient objective evidences, that they have any revelations at all from God, much less, that they have such particular revelations, and far less yet that they are led by them: and therefore, we ought not to believe them, as to any of these things.

§. 19. A *Third* subterfuge is, that this evidence cannot be assigned but to the well disposed understanding. But it is a very pitiful one, for why may they not [illegible] assigne, hold forth and propone this evidence (being objective) of their *Enthusiasms*, which is all that we seek, although it will actually satisfie and content the well disposed only. So it is very irrational to say, that this evidence can be assigned only, to them who are of the Q. minde already, and so need not to seek an evidence, that they may believe, but not to others who need it (for by being *disposed* it seems they understand being of their own way.) Notwithstanding that all men, according to them, have a measure of the Spirit, and some not of their way, according to them, *pag.* 17. and 81. are judicious, and unprejudicate;

and may not any Heretick in the World deny evidences upon the same account.

§. 20. So our Adversaries cannot get us shifted. And therefore, after so many windings and turnings, they assigne us some shadows of evidences which we are now to examine. The *first* then, assigned by us one the stage, and owned by them, is *their own declaration, of having the Spirit of God*, which is disproved, because it as really agrees to *Enthusiast Hereticks* as to them. But here we meet with an other retortion of theirs set down *pag.* 5. 58. *&c.* Your master (say they) being *pressed* by the Jesuit to assigne a ground of the *Protestants Religion*, which *Hereticks* could not pretend to, named the *Scriptures*; and the *Jesuit*, further urged that Hereticks could, and did pretend to the Scriptures: Or to represent the matter more faithfully, out of the printed Papers. The *Jesuit* required a ground, which *Hereticks* could not pretend to, (*p.* 3.) Mr *Menzies* preoccupied the Cavil of groundless pretending, illustrated the matter by examples, and declared, that the chief principal of the *Protestants Religion* consists in its conformity to the will of God revealed in the Scriptures, (*p.* 5.) And when the *Jesuit* urged that a false religion could pretend the like conformity (*p.* 13.) *Mr. Minzies* answered, that it was not a pretended, but real conformity with the *Scriptures* that demonstrats a *true Religion* (*p.* 16, &c.) But what follows? Did we invade the Q. with these *popish Weapons* on the stage? No such thing. We argued from *being as good*, and not from *pretending*, as we have shewn already in our censure of their *account*. If their new found light, had not eclipsed the *Light* of their consciences, they had not misrepresented things so maliciously.

§. 21. Another evidence assigned by *R. B.* in the Dispute, is that the *Spirit* (or new objective revelations) *teacheth to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts*, &c. *p.* 15. To which we say 1. That ungodliness, and worldly lusts, are not known but by these revelations as the rule, according to Q. and so supposeth the knowledge and evidence of these revelations, as necessarly prerequisite, that we may know what things are ungodliness, and worldly lusts. 2. Suppose we knew what things are ungodliness, *&c.* independently from these revelations, yet we, cannot know that the Spirit teacheth them so, for other *Enthusiasts* as the blasphemous *David George*, *Familists* and many *Anabaptists*, as also the pretended *Saints*, *S. Francis* with the *Beguards* and *Beguini*, *S. Dominicks*, *S. Brigite*, *S. Catherine*, *S. Loyola*, with many others, and their followers, in the *Romish* Church. Yea, even *Montanus* and his Disciples, *&c.* pretend such inward Teachings, and put one the same sheep-skins, and outward shews of godliness:

neſſe: ſo that, if this be a good evidence for the Q. it will be the ſame for all theſe *Enthuſiaſts*. But 3. The evil ſpirit may teach a man to deny ſome ſins, (*v. g.* prodigality *&c.*) that he may cauſe them fall into other ſins, *v. g.* Avarice and Worldlineſs, wherewith Q. are generally branded; and how ſhall we know, that the Spirit in them teacheth to deny all ſin.

§. 22. Another evidence mentioned by *G K.* both in the account and poſtcript, is *immediate teſtimony of the Spirit*. But we have manifeſted already, §. 14. and 15. that it lies upon them to evidence, that we have ſuch a Teſtimony, and likewiſe have *ex ſuperabundanti*, given in ſeveral reaſons, that we have no ſuch thing.

§. 23. *G. K.* At laſt, in name of the Q. (*p.* 16 and 68.) produces the *Teſtimony of the Scriptures*, as the beſt external and greateſt evidence that can be given unto us, *&c.* But they intend only to put a cheat upon us, and not to give us an evidence that may ſatisfie Conſciences; and therefore we argue againſt them thus. According to Q. we cannot know the true ſenſe of *Scriptures*, nor are obliedged to believe them without new objective revelations of them, and ſo we may be deceived with the *Scriptures*, *propter defectum ex parte objecti*, *i. e.* becauſe the objects are not ſufficiently revealed. *Therefore* the Scriptures Teſtimony is not well aſſigned by the Q. as an evidence of the Spirit in them, or of ſuch revelations in them. The *firſt propoſition* is confeſt, and the *ſecond* follows clearly out of it, for we know no ſuch revelations. How can they *bona fide*, deſire us believe upon the accompt of a Scripture proof, that they have any revelations, or ſuch particular revelations, or are led by them, ſeing according to them, we cannot know the true ſenſe of *Scriptures*, nor are obliedged to believe them, till the *Spirit* reveal them over again immediatly, which he has not as yet done? Will they ſay, that we may know the ſenſe of the *Scriptures*, and are obliedged to believe without new objective revelations, which their *Spirit* accompts a falſhood, *&c?* Or will they have us to deceive our ſelves by ſenſing, and believing the Scriptures without theſe revelations? Or will they ſatisfie any mans Conſcience, either of the wayes? Surely if they had intended to ſatisfie Conſciences, they had pitched upon certain evidences, which ſhould demonſtrat them to have, and to be led by theſe *Enthuſiaſms*, and that independently from the Scriptures, and every other thing, which according to them borrows Faith from theſe *Enthuſiaſms*.

§. 24. To anſwer, that it is *argumentum ad hominem*, and an evidence of their ſpirit and revelations according to our own principles, be-

becauſe we may know the true ſenſe of the Scriptures, and are obliedged to believe them without theſe revelations and not to be deceived according to our ſelves, is a very ridiculous ſhift. For 1. it is not *argumentum ad hominem*, for though we hold that the Scriptures do obliedge us, and that the ſenſe of them may be known without theſe revelations; yet we deny their Gloſſes to be the true ſenſe. 2. Although it were *argumentum ad hominem*, yet ſuch an argument can never be an evidence ſufficient to clear the Conſcience. 3. Either we do well in ſaying, that we may know the true ſenſe of *Scriptures*, and are obliedged to believe them, without theſe revelations or we lie? If the *firſt*, they deny the neceſſity of their revelations. If the *ſecond*, they bid us believe a lie without any real evidence. 4. Either the Scripture is a full and ſufficient evidence to us, that the Q. are led by the Spirit of God in all their tenets and wayes, or not? If not, why do they give it to us for an evidence? But, if it be, then it is a ſufficient rule, yea, the chief rule; For *propter quod unumquodque & tale, illud ipſum eſt magis tale* (as *R. B.* ſayes in his Theſes) but in that caſe we ſhould believe and own theſe revelations, as the rule *for the Scripture*, or becauſe the Scripture bids us; and therefore, we ought to believe and own the Scripture, for the rule, more then them. 5. They would have us to reſolve our Faith into a Circle, for they would have us to believe theſe revelations for the Scriptures, and again, to believe the *Scriptures* for theſe revelations.

§. 25. To ſay, that they make the *Scriptures* a *ſecondary* rule, is but a ſhift alſo; for either they make the *Scriptures* a ſecondary rule to themſelves onely, who have as they pretend, the things contained in the *Scriptures* revealed over again immediatly to them? Or they make them a ſecondary rule to us alſo, who have no ſuch revelations? If to themſelves only, we are but where we were; for then they cannot *bona fide*, give the *Scriptures* Teſtimony as an evidence to us, who know not ſuch revelations, and they themſelves need it not to be an evidence to them. If they make it a ſecondary rule to us alſo, who have no ſuch revelations, then the *Scriptures* ſhould bind and obliedge us without theſe revelations: for there cannot be a rule *In moralibus*, except it be obligative, and conſequently the *Scriptures* cannot be a rule to us except it bind us, which is contrary to the Q. principle. Whatſoever of theſe the adverſaries chooſe, we are not to believe them. If the *firſt*, we ought not to believe; becauſe they can give us no evidence. If the *ſecond*, we are not to believe, becauſe the *Scripture* is a ſufficient rule without theſe revelations,

lations, and so they lie to us, in asserting a necessity of these revelations.

§. 26. If it bee said, that they make the Scripture a secondary rule in it self only, and not to us, nor themselves. We reply, 1. That this is a *Popish shift*, for they make the Scripture a rule, *in se* without the testimony of their Church, but not a rule *quoad nos*, till we have that Testimony. 2. The Scriptures cannot be a rule of Faith and Manners, whether *Principal or secondary*, except it be a rule and obligative in respect of us; for such a rule is the measure of our Duty. 3. *Hoc dato, non concesso*, the scripture should neither be a satisfactory evidence to them, nor to us.

§. 27. *G.K.* alledgeth, that in his producing the Scriptures Testimony for an evidence to us, who professe to own the Scriptures for our chiefest rule, he doth imitate Christ (so insinuating a *Retortion*) who referred the Jews rejecting his own immediate Testimony, which should have been received as greater then the Testimony of his servants, *Moses* and the *Prophets*, and sent them back unto the Scripture which they owned as their rule. But he is mistaken. For 1. Christ never taught, that they could not know the true sense of the Scriptures, nor were obliedged to believe them without new objective immediate revelations, as the Q. teach; for if he had done so, and yet referred them to the Scriptures (they denying, as we must suppose now to make the cases alike, these new revelations) he had contradicted his own Doctrine, which he taught as true in opposition to theirs, and bidden them believe, what they were not obliedged to believe, nor could know the true sense of, and so to do evil, that good might come of it, as the Q. bids us. 2. The Jews rejected only the immediate outward Testimony of Christ, and not any such objective, inward self-evidencing testimony, as the Q. maintains. For, he neither would, nor needed, if they had done so, to remit them to the Scripture, which they ought not to believe, nor could know the sense of, without these revelations. 3. Christs outward Testimony, being sufficiently confirmed, ought to have been received by the Jews, as greater then his servants testimony; for they had sufficient evidence, that he spake, and that he was most worthy of credit. But as to the inward objective Testimony of the Spirit, we have no such thing our selves, and we ought not to believe Q. more pretending such a Testimony, then the Scriptures, because we have no evidence of the same. 4*ly*. The Jews ought

ought to have received the Scriptures teſtimony as from Chriſt; becauſe both according to him and them, the Scriptures were the rule, and they needed only illumination, that they might know the ſenſe of them, and no new objective revelations. But we in the Diſpute refuſed the Scriptures teſtimony as an evidence of the Spirit from the Q. not (as G. K. belies us, *pag.* 67.) becauſe they ſay they have a greater evidence: but becauſe they ſay we ought not to believe the Scriptures, nor can know the true ſenſe of them, except we know theſe new objective revelations. But, 5. G. K. *acts the part of a cunning Sophiſt,* (*p.* 68, 69.) when he ſayes, *I profeſs ſincerely in Gods fear, that the Scriptures teſtimony is to me as full and plain and convincing to prove this truth, as to prove that Chriſt was the Meſſiah*: For the Scriptures teſtimony is not looked upon by him or any Q. as ſufficient to prove, either the one, or the other, without immediate objective revelations. *Laſtly*, that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah* can be proved from the Scriptures: but that the Q. have ſuch revelations of Gods Spirit, and are led by them, cannot be proven at all from the Scriptures.

§. 28. By this time, we hope, it is evident enough that the Scriptures teſtimony produced by Q. cannot be a ſufficient evidence to us of their revelations. But for the ſatisfaction of the Reader, we ſhall take a brief ſurvey of the Argument, which they have ſet down to us, *pag.* 16. 68. And though we ought not to believe it according to them, yet we ſhall ſee what real ſtrength is in it. *All men* (ſay they) *have a meaſure of the inſpiration of the Spirit of God, according to the Scriptures teſtimony, that* Chriſt the true light inlighteneth every man that comes into the world: *and that* a manifeſtation of the Spirit is given to every one to profit withal: But *this univerſal illumination, or manifeſtation, is inſpiration. Anſ.* 1. By retorting the Argument thus: If all men have a meaſure of the inſpiration of the Spirit of God, then *Papiſts, Mahumetans, Pagans*, and which is worſe, *men bodily poſſeſt with the Devil*, &c. who are men, have a meaſure of the inſpiration of the Spirit of God: and ſo if we ought to believe that the Q. have ſuch particular revelations, and hearken to their pretending the ſame upon this accompt, we ought alſo upon the ſame accompt to believe the foreſaid perſons have ſuch revelations, and to hearken to them pretending the ſame; and if we ought not to believe Q. upon this account, they give us no evidence whereon we may believe them. *Anſ.* 2. All men have a meaſure of this inſpiration in a day only, according to Q. themſelves. How then are we obliged to believe them, ſeing we cannot know if their day of viſitation be paſt? *Anſ.* 3. Either they are inſpired in every thing, or only in ſome things: If in

every

every thing, then they are altogether infallible: If in some things only, in what things, and how shall we know whether in these, or in other things? It lyes therefore upon our adversaries to prove, that they are inspired in such particular things, as they would have us believe them, or approve the same. But, 4. we *answer* directly, these Scriptures do not prove, that all men have a measure of these inspirations. The first Scripture is found in *Joh.* 1. 9. which our Divines have already vindicated, both often and largely; and therefore, we only say this to it at present, There is a subjective inlightning or clearing of the understanding; and Christ inlighteneth some in a natural, and some in a supernatural way, and so it is incumbent on our *Antagonists*, to prove that it is objective revelation, which is understood here. But giving and not granting this to them, the place is to be understood of light indefinitly, whether supernatural, and given immediatly, or natural, and given in the use of means: so that the sense is, that Christ inlighteneth every man that cometh into the world, with some light, either natural, or supernatural, and all the light, that any man has, is given by Christ: and is not to be understood only immediat and supernatural inspirations given to all men. The second Scripture cited by them, is to be found, 1 *Cor.* 12 7. But it is most impertinently alledged, to prove that all men have a measure of such inspirations of the Spirit of God, for (to omit diverse others very material things, which have been frequently produced by our Divines, for the vindication of this Text) the Apostle there speaketh of the gifts of the Spirit whatsoever bestowed upon many of these *Corinthians*, for the profit and edification of the Church (the most whereof Q. themselves cannot lay claim to now) which is clearly illustrated in the following verses, where he subjoyns as a reason of this assertion, for *to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another Prophesie, to another discerning of spirits, to another diverse kinds of tongues, to another interpretation of tongues, to another working of miracles, to another healing*, &c. and so he speaketh not of such immediat objective revelations only, as given to all and every man whatsoever, which our adversaries ought to prove; yea, he demonstrateth from the necessity of diverse members in the natural body, the necessity of distributing these gifts to diverse members of that Church, and consequently the necessity of not giving such immediat objective revelations, and the gift of Prophesie to all of them: but in a word, the sense of the place is, that every one of these *Corinthians*, who had any gift of the Spirit vouchsafed upon them, had it given him for the edification of the Church, even as the sense of that place, *Joh.* 2. 10. *Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine*, is that every man who hath good

wine,

wine, doth so for the entertaining of his guests, and not that all and every man doth so, for some have not wine at all to their dinners, much less good wine.

§. 29. By what hath been said, the Reader may perceive, how unreasonable and impudent these our *adversaries* are, in averring that *all men have a manifestation of the Spirit, whereby they may understand the Scriptures, if they do improve it, p. 26.)* and likewise, that they have given us no evidences, upon which we may believe them to have such Enthusiastical revelations, or to be led thereby; which seing they cannot perform, as they ought, we shall in the next place, indevour to prove, that they have no such thing as these revelations, or the Spirit of God.

Sub-section 3.

The Quakers have immediate supernatural objective revelations from the Spirit of God.

§. 30. First of all, we might argue from their mad and impious practices; for should they not follow the immediat conduct of the Spirit in all the steps of their conversations? And if they do not so, how shall we know in what things they are immediatly led by the Spirit, and in what things they are not? But not to insist on this, have they not committed most horrid practices, which they openly taught to have been allowed and commanded by the Spirit in them? It were tedious to rehearse all their pranks of this nature, which are to be found at great length let down in *Clerks Examples, Pagets Heresiographie, Hicks Dialogues, Fauldo's Quakerism no Christianity*, &c. It shall suffice us to give in a *specimen* of them, out of D. *Henry Moir*, as being both eminent and credible, and likewise esteemed so by our *Antagonists*, who have, as we conceive, without any just ground, often reported through the City of *Aberdene*, that *H. Moir* is a Quaker, and owns their *chiefest principles* in a Letter lately written to *G. K.* These then are his words in his *Mystery of Godliness*, p. 111, 112. "To "what more rationally then to the possession of these deceiving spirits, "can be attributed these wilde extasies they are in, their falling down "dead, the swelling of their body, and foaming at the mouth. —— "Add to this, their being troubled with apparitions, their hideous "howlings and cryings, their wilde and extatical singings, and frantick dances,

" dances, their running naked through Towns into Churches, and
" private Houses, their violent and irresistable shakings, to the utter
" weakening of Nature, and making their bodies sore, and all this
" transacted by a power or spirit, which themselves confess distinct
" from themselves, which imposeth on them absurd commands, using
" their hands and arms to the beating of their head and body. ——
" To condemn him to the guidance of every foolish flye that cometh
" in his sight, and so to adjudge him so long and so close to the fire
" (the flye guiding him the time) that is was scorched from the knee
" to the foot, these are the more severe and rigid services of that in-
" fernal Task-master. Besides that ever and anone, this inward, and
" sometime outward, utters very audibly to them some place or other
" of Scripture to a ridiculous use and prophanation, and not that
" only, but forces the poor captivated Vassals, in scorn and contempt
" of Christ, to act some remarkable passage in his Story, such as his
" death and triumph at *Jerusalem*, the former by *James Milner* and
" *John Toldervie*, the latter by *James Naylor*, who had his horse led
" in triumph by two women trudging in dirt, at his entering into
" *Bristol*, with Holy, holy, and Hosannahs sung to him by the Phan-
" tical Company that attended him; Garments also in some places
" strowed in the way: Such wilde tricks are these deluded souls made
" to play, to make sport to these Aerial Gobbins that drive and actuate
" them, *&c.* We know not what our Adversaries can answer here;
for they cannot refute these matters of fact, neither deny their pre-
tending the Spirit for the same, nor can they any wayes justifie them.
To this we shall only add, that *William Dundass* Q. in his Book intituled, *A few words from the Spirit of Truth*, hath set down as words of the Spirit, a bundle of ridiculous and non-sensical expressions and passages, such as, (p. 7.) *What a mingle, mangle, mungle, gillimafra's of omni-gatherums —— and hodge-podge ads*, &c. But not to rake longer in this dung-hill.

§. 31. We argue secondly thus, That Spirit which teacheth Doctrines, directly opposite to the revelations of God's Spirit in the Scriptures, is not the Spirit of God. But the spirit in the Q. is such: *Ergo, the spirit in the Q.* is not the Spirit of God. The assumption, which only can be called in question, hath as many proofs, as there are testimonies in Scripture against their Tenents; so that all our Arguments from the Scriptures may be applyed here; but notwithstanding, we shall make use of two or three for this purpose directly; and first, The spirit in them teacheth, that the Lords Supper with Bread and Wine is not lawful, nor to be continued in the Church, directly contrary to these Scriptural revelations, *Mat.* 26. 26, *&. Mar.* 14. 22, *&c.*

Luke 22. 19. That the Lords Supper with Bread and Wine is commanded here, they cannot deny, and

§. 32. *That it is still binding*, we prove thus, what was instituted by Christ, and is not ceased of its own nature, nor repealed formaly, but has been owned in practise, and doctrine, by the Church in all ages, is still binding: But such is the Lords Supper with bread and wine, *ergo bread and wine* (we say) but we do not exclude the things signified by them. The *major* is beyond exception, and therefore, our adversaries nible at the *minor*; and endeavour first to shew, that it hath ceased of its own nature. *The very institution* (saith *R. B. in his truth cleared of calumnies*, p. 54. 55.) *intimates the abolishing thereof at Christs coming*, and this coming, is his spiritual coming in the heart. But for reply, 1. These words (*ye do shew forth the Lords death till he come*) which *Robin* alludes unto, are only *S. Pauls* words, and no part of the institution; which is evident from the collation of that place to the Corinthians, with the forecited places of the Evangelists, and from the Apostles, saying in the third Person (the Lords death till he come) whereas, in the preceeding verses, containing the Institution, he brings in the Lord himself speaking in the first Person, *my Body, my Blood*, &c.

§. 33. This coming, must be Christs coming to Judgement, at the end of the World; for it is not his coming again in the body after his resurrection, as our adversaries do confess, nor his coming in a miraculous effusion of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, in the day of Pentecost; for, after that the Apostle delivers this Ordinance to the Corinthians, and subjoins, that in observing it, they shew forth the Lords death till he come: yea, if it were his coming in such a miraculous effusion of the gifts of the Holy Ghost unto Christians, this Ordinance were to be observed now, seing Christ cometh not to them in such a miraculous way now. Nor is it his Spiritual coming into the heart, by the ordinary effusion of his gifts and graces; for at the very institution of this Supper, it was to be received by the Apostles, and we hope Q. dare not say but even then Christ was come into their hearts, that way. It will be a firm argument; that the Q. themselves are graceless, if they presume to aver, that the Apostles were destitute of grace then. Again, Faith and Grace is prerequired to the receiving of this Supper, as is to the full holden forth 1 *Cor.* 11. and *alibi passim*; and therefore, this Supper is to be received after, and not only till this coming: But moreover, after all these comings, *S. Paul* renewed the command of receiving this Supper, to the Corinthians, 2 *Cor.* 12.

§. 34.

§. 34. We know they answer to this, that he only narrates the Institution, and doth not renewe the Command. But they may be easily redargued; for 1. He often gives the Title of the Lords Supper to it, even as received by these Corinthians, which sheweth, that even then, the Lord had not abolished it from being his. 2. What he received of the Lord, he delivered unto them. But a command to *take, eat, do this* &c. He received of the Lord; *ergo*, a command *to take, eat, doe this* &c, he delivered unto them. Suppose a minion of a King, should writ after this manner to a City, what I received of the King, I deliver unto you, immediatly subjoining a decree of the King, and the City likewise were sufficiently assured of his commission and fidelity, what subject, except a Quaker, would find in his heart, after this to be so disloyal, as to say, the Minion had only narrated this Decree Historically, and not given it as a binding Law unto that City. The application is easie. But 3. any sober Person will perceive clearly, that the Apostle in this Chapter reprehends the Corinthians for several abuses, in receiving the Lords Supper, for example, *that there were* divisions among them (v. 18.) that in eating, every one took before other his own supper, and one was hungry, and another was drunken (v. 21.) But he is so far, from taking them off from the Ordinance it self, that for the rectification of these abuses, he brings them back to the very Institution, which he would not have done, if it had no wayes obliged them. And now, if the Apostle could argue therefrom, against their abuses in the way of receiving, much more can the duty it self (of receiving) be concluded from the same institution. 4. The Apostle in v. 26. insinuats that it was a duty lying upon them, by vertue of the first *Institution*, to receive this Ordinance; for the very first word of it (to wit *for*) clearly imports a reason founded upon the words of the *Institution*, preceeding immediatly; and the words *this bread this cup* which have a necessary relation to the bread, and cup mentioned in the Institution, do shew the bread and cup they received, were instituted by Christ; and the words (*ye shew forth the Lords death*) do argue that the same spiritual benefits would accrue unto them by their receiving, which the Lord annexed at first to the Apostles receiving, who were also commanded to do it in remembrance of him. For suppose the foresaid Minion should add to his foresaid Commission delivered, as said is, that *how often ye do observe this statute, ye shall fulfil the end of it, and obtain the promise annexed to it*, common sense would teach any rational person, that the said act remained in vigor unrepealed. To which join the word (often) which evidences that it was a practise to be continued in. To which Argument, deduced from the words of this verse, *R. B.* (p. 4. of

4. of his W. M. *unmasqued*) gives in this, only *answer*, that hence it would follow, that *as often as a man sins, he ofends God, did import we should sin often.* But herein egregiously he discovers his folly and impiety; for we do not argue from the words (often) precisly, but from the whole verse, and who will say, that ever sin was inflicted by God, as this Bread and this Cup were, or does serve to shew forth the Lords Death. 5. The Apostle prescrives the right manner of receiving this Ordinance, to wit, that they should *examine themselves, receive worthily* &c. under the pain of condemnation; which he would never have done, if this Ordinance it self had been a thing indifferent or abolished, but surely would have forbidden both the Supper, and the abuses together, as useless and pernicious. But 6. and lastly, we have the Apostles express command for the continuance of this Ordinance, v. 28. *let a man examine himself and so let him eat*, and to say, that they are only permitted to eat out of condescendence, is a desperate shift. For if they were commanded to examine, then likewise to eat, since both in the original are expressed the same way in the third Person of the imperative Mood, which in the English cannot be rendred but by the word, *let*: And what ever way, they might shift the duty of receiving, they might also shift the duty of examining: But so it is, that they were commanded to examine, which the Q. themselves will not presume to deny; and therefore, they were also commanded to eat. And besides this, there is not the least mention, throughout this whole Chapter, though it be the proper place, and seat of this doctrine.

§ 35. But (say they) when the substance comes the shadows evanish. *Answ*; we would know what they mean by the substance. If it be the graces of the Spirit S. *Paul* is so far from being of their mind, that (1 *Cor.* 11.) he excomunicats all from the Supper, who have not this substance. But 2. If there were any solidity in this, then to the end of the world, this ordinance cannot be abolished, for alwayes there will be some destitute of this substance. 3. They, who had this substance of grace under the law, ought to have rejected the Paschal-lamb, the sacrifices, washings and the rest of the Mosaical shadows, and types of Christ. If by substance, they understand extraordinary gifts, such as were those of working miracles and speaking with tongues, &c. Poured out on the Apostles in the day of Pentecost, then this ordinance is to be continued in the Church while we want those gifts. If they say, that this substance is *the Godhead of Christ* it could never be from us, being alwayes every where; and so cannot be that substance, which is to come to us. If they say this substance is *the manhood of Christ*, the body which was broken for us, and the blood which was shed for the sins of many, they say truth, and from the same we

argue

argue against them thus. If the body of Christ which was broken for us and the blood which was shed for the sins of many, be the things which are signified by bread and wine in the Lords Supper, and in remembrance of which we are to eat and drink, then the Lords Supper with bread and wine is a standing ordinance and to be continued in the Church till Christs second coming bodily, to judge the world, at the last day. But the first is true; and therefore the last also. The *Sequel* is clear, for the shadows and symbols are to continue till the coming of the substance or thing signified by them. To which add that of S. *Paul ye shew forth the Lords death till he come.* The minor is proved from the words of the institution, *take, eat, this is my body* &c. for how will the Q. expound them, but as we do that the bread is a signe of the body of Christ: so whatsoever they have brought to shew, that the Lords Supper with bread and wine, hath expired of its own nature are evanished into shadows.

§ 36. Now we proceed to examine their formal repeals, all of which it were tedious, particularly to convase; and therefore we shall hint only at two of the chiefest, our *adversaries* have already published, by which the rest also may be discussed. The first assigned by R. B. p 54. *of his Book of Calumnies* is 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17. *The cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? for we being many are one bread*, &c. whence he infers, that, if it be the inward and spiritual bread, which is that one bread, then the outward is ceased, and if it be the outward bread, which is that one bread, then there is no inward and spiritual bread. *Ans.* 1. The true and genuine sense of that place is, that the sacramental bread which the Ministers of the Gospel consecrate, is a signe and symbol of Saints their communion, or partaking all of them together of Christs body; for they being many men and women are one mistically in Christ (even as a loaf made up of many grains is physically one bread) which appears from their partaking all together of the outward sacramental bread and the inward spiritual bread of the supplies of grace, which two are one sacramentally: whence the Apostle sheweth their duty of flying from idolatry, and drinking the cup of devils, and also insinuats the duty of love and unity among themselves; but it will not follow that Christs ordinance of this Supper with bread is abrogated. 2. Now we *ans.* R. B. that, this one bread spoken of in the first part of the 17. vers. is neither outward bread, which the Ministers of the Gospel consecrat and break, nor is it the inward and spiritual bread of grace, which nourisheth the soul; But it is the mystical bread (Gods Saints, who are united in Christ like grains of wheat in a loaf) and really distinct from them both, which we prove thus. The eleven Apostles at Christs institution were

one

one bread mystical in Christ, and yet without any contradiction or making them not one bread, in that sense Christ instituted his Supper with other bread of a diverse kind, or will the Q: say that this Supper was repealed, when Christ was but instituting it? and further, notwithstanding the oneness of this mystical bread, there is another proper bread mentioned in the 16. v. which *Paul* blessed and brake; or will the Q: say, that the Apostle did break this mystical bread, or break the Saints in their Spiritual unities? and again there is one bread mentioned in the latter part of this 17. ver. where of all the Saints who are one bread mystically, *are partakers*, and the partaking of which evidences the Saints to be one bread mystically; which can be no other but the foresaid outward or inward, or rather both Sacramentally one bread: whence it manifestly follows, that the foresaid mystical bread was distinct from both these. But, 3. We say, that the one bread spoken of in the latter part of the 17. *vers.* whereof all the Saints *are partakers*, is both the outward and the inward bread, and yet but one Sacramentally, and in respect of a symbolical union, as Christ in the institution saith of the bread, that it is *his body*. Neither will *R. B.* his objection (*p.* 64. of his *Calumnies*) signifie any thing against us, to wit, that then the Mosaical types and shadows of Christ should be continued in the Church, as being one with Christ in that sense: for though, under the Law, they were in this improper sense one with Christ, and so to be continued in the Church then, yet they are not so one with Christ now, not being signs and symboles of him, because they are abrogated, and consequently not to be continued in the Church now.

§ 37. The second *repeal* produced by *R. B.* (*p.* 55. of his foresaid Book) is *Col.* 2. 16, 17. *Let no man judge you in meat or in drink*, &c. *Ans.* 1. The proposition is not universal, so as to conclude any thing against the Lords Supper; for then, *first*, it had not been lawful for *Paul* to have reprehended the *Corinthians* as he doth, 1 *Cor.* 11. for the abuses in receiving of the Lords Supper, because that was to judge them in meat and drink. *Secondly*, If it were so, none ought to challenge any person for glutting themselves with too much meat or drink: So that ere the Q. miss to pull down Christs Ordinance, they will make way for gluttony and drunkenness. It lies then upon our adversaries to prove, that the Lords Supper is included in this. But we *answer*, 2. That the Jewish and Legal Ceremonies only are to be understood here; for they are said, *vers.* 14. *to be blotted out by Christ, and to be an hand-writing of Ordinances contrary to us, and to be taken out of the way, being nailed to Christs Cross*, &c. To which is immediatly subjoyned, *Let no man therefore* (or for this cause) *judge you in meat, or in drink*, &c. *which are a shadow of things to come, but*

the

the body is of Christ. But will the Q. say that the Lords Supper was contrary to us, or was nailed to Christs Cross, and so abrogated two or three dayes after its institution, before Christ came again: So a *primo ad ultimum*, the Spirit in Q. by denying the Lords Supper with bread and wine, teacheth a Doctrine directly opposite to the revelations of Gods Spirit in the Scriptures. But leaving this, we go on to a second proof of this assertion, which is that,

§. 38. The spirit in them teacheth an absolute and sinless perfection (in personal inherent righteousness, so that men upon earth may abstain from sin for many dayes and years, as they live long or short after their entry into that state) to be attainable in this life, directly contrary to these express Scriptures, *We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses* (whatsoever, and without exception) *are as filthy rags*, Isai. 64. 6. We are commanded by Christ, Matth. 6. 12. To pray daily, *forgive us our sins*: and so doubtless, there is no day that we are free from sin. *To will is present with me* (saith the great Apostle Paul) *but how to perform that which is good, I find not*, Rom. 7. 18. *Sin dwelleth in me*, and v. 20. *I see a Law in my members warring against the Law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members*, vers. 23. *The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh*: and *these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would*, Gal. 5. 17 *If we say that we have no sin, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us*, saith the beloved Apostle, (1 *Joh.* 1. 8.) including himself with all other Christians, to whom this general epistle is written. R. B. in his Book of *Calumnies*, p. 71. Would have this verse to be conditional, if we say so, and yet walk in darkness; because the 6. ver. is such. To which we *answer*, by granting that indeed the 6. ver. is conditional; but from hence to infer, that this 8. ver. is conditional also, is most irrational, and like the rest of this mans consequences, will be say, that the 10. ver. which is as strong for our purpose, is likewise conditional; because the 6. is such. So he may go one, and as rationally assert the like of all the verses in the whole Epistle. *Another* of his subterfuges is *John speaking*, in the first Person of the plural number, doth not import *John* himself to be of that number, more then the Apostle *James* saying cap. 3. 9. *with the tongue we curse men*, will prove *James* to have been one of these cursers, but it seems he is not acquainted with Ecclesiastical Discipline (for which we are sory) else he would never thought it so strange that *James* should be termed a curser of men; for this further instruction, we refer him to 1 *Cor.* 16. 22. *If any man love not the Lord Jesus, let him be Anathema Maranatha, accursed until*

the Lord come, and to *Gal.* 5. 12. *I wish they were even cut off, that trouble you.* which power of cursing and excomunicating men, was common to *James* with the other Apostles, and belongs as yet to the Pastors of the Church. We might also shew him, how *Elisha* cursed the *Children*, and *Paul* cursed *Elymas* the sorcerer, &c. To liberate him of his admiration, we might likewise say, that these words are to be rendred by way of interrogation, *and do we therewith curse men?* even as the following words, which are brought for a proof of the same, are rendred by way of question, *can a fig-tree bear olive-berries?* But passing by these we *answer*, 1. that suppose it were sinful cursing which is spoken of by *James*, and he himself, who was for his singular holiness and uprightness denominated *Justus*, were to be excluded, yet we have not the least ground to exclude *John* in the other place; yea, all the Scriptures already cited in this Paragraph, do evidently evince that he is to be included. To which, for further confirmation we subjoyn these other two luculent Testimonies, one of *Solomons*, Eccles. 7. 20. *there is not a just man upon earth, that doth good and sinneth not.* And the other of *James* 3. 2. *in many things we offend all.* Answer 2. this place of *James* may be understood (as *Estius*, *a lapide*, and others expound that of the Psalmist, *all men are liars*) that *James* of his own nature, was prone to curse with the Tongue, no less then other men; was not *Peter* a holy man also, and an Apostle, as well as *James*? and yet he had the root of sin in him, and did break out into actual cursing, when he denied his Lord. And so we grant freely, that *James* was included in that place, and the Q. shift is invalidated. *Ans.* 3. *James* may have been a curser, even in the worst sense before his conversion, and in reference to that time, may have reckoned himself amongst cursers in this place. But the principal scope of it is, (as we conceive) as if he had said, that the Tongue is the instrument wherewith we curse men, when we curse them, we are not ignorant, how that our *Adversaries* in this point, have invented many other exceptions against the Scriptures; but they have been frequently and solidly refuted by our Divines, especially by D. *Tillie* in his *Dissertatiuncula de sensu Pauli 7. ad Romanos*, in the mean time these quaking Perfectionists, by teaching such a perfection, teacheth a Doctrine directly opposite to the revelations of Gods Spirit in the Scriptures. But

§. 39. *Thirdly*, and not to instance more at present, of their anti-scriptural Doctrines, the spirit in them teacheth, that in a constitute and setled Church, Women may discharge the office of a Preacher, upon as good grounds, and with as great authority as men, directly contrare to these Scriptures, 1. *Cor.* 14. 34, 35. *Let your women keep silence*

silence in the Churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the Law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the Church. 1 *Tim.* 2. 12. *&c. Let the women learn in silence with all subjection, but I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence,* We know that *G. K.* (who is too much addicted to women) hath by several shifts and inventions, endeavoured to elude these clear Scripture Testimonies; but they are so ridiculous and impertinent, that the very serious reading of the Texts themselves, may be a sufficient confutation of them all. For first, by a strange allegory, he expounds the woman to be the flesh, alledging the authority of *Bernard*, abbot of *claravilla* (*whom he calls an ancient Father in the Church*) and of *St. Augustine* for the same. Could he have produced more of the Fathers for this Glos, he would doubtless have done it; but as to these cited by him, they do not in these places, comment upon the foresaid Scriptures; but only hint at them overly in an allegorical way, and yet nevertheless, as we conceive, they never denyed the literal sense to be true, and chiefly intended by the Spirit of God: But suppose they had done so, we might repone the proverbial speach, *Bernardus non vidit omnia*, and oppose to them large catologues of the Fathers, who comment at great length upon these Scriptures, and expone the same literally; as for example, *Chrysostom*, *Æcumenius* &c. Whom it became our adversaries to have cited, rather then these, who touched these places only passingly: And also that *women* is here taken in the literal sense, we evict from the Texts themselves, which speak of such *women* as was *Eva*, instanced in the place to *Timothy*, that have their own men in the plural number, whom they ought to ask at home, and are to bring forth, and educate Children, and that shall be saved eternally, notwithstanding of their bringing forth their Children in pain and the like temporal crosses, if they continue in Faith and Charity, &c. So the most part of Interpreters, expone the last verse of the womens continuing in Faith, &c. Neither doth the change of the singular number into the plural move us; for the Apostle is speaking of the whole sex of women, and in the foregoing verses, uses sometimes the singular and sometimes the plural number; neither can Children be meaned, by (*they*) who are to continue, seing the salvation of the *women* depends not upon the childrens Faith, &c.) But to return, will these effeminate Cavillars presume to say, that the *Flesh* (even taken as they would have it, for the animal and inferior part of man, which is the Creature of God) is such a woman as *Eva* was, that the spirit is many husbands in the plu-

ral number, or that good works are children, in birth whereof, persons shall be saved, if they continue in Faith and Charity, that is, they shall be saved in bringing forth good works, if they continue in good works. But where is their any ground in these places, for their allegorical exposition? and to impose the same, as the Primary sense intended by the Holy Ghost, without a ground in the Text, is it not the high way to abuse the whole Scripture? Have not some of our Antagonists been observed to make a Welch-mans hose of the first Chapter of Genesis, which treats concerning the very Creation, betaking themselves to this way of Exposition? and have not some Q. been bold to averre, that there was never any such real Tree, as is called the Tree of knowledge of good and evil?

§. 40. Like unto this, is that other evasion brought by this Sophist for his bad cause, to wit, that women are only forbidden there to speak in the Church by permission; for though the Apostle say, *I permit not* (or I forbid) *a woman to teach*, yet he saith not *I permit not a woman to teach by permission*: yea, if it be unlawful for women to speak in the Church by permission, which is to ask questions for their own instruction, and to give advice relating to Church-affairs, then *a fortiori* it is unlawful for them to speak by commandment (for which Q. so hotly contest) seing by that rather they would usurp authority over the men, which is the reason of *Pauls* prohibition. As to the rest of Mr. *Keiths* quibles against these clear Texts, doth our Church allow unto Whores authoritative teaching, which is only forbidden by the Apostle; for *it is not permitted* (saith he) *unto them to speak, but to be under obedience*, &c. Whence it also appears, that Women may likewise sing in the Church. Do we judge it unlawful for Christian Women to teach Heathens, and speak in an unconstituted Church, (as the woman did, who is storied to have converted the *Iberians*) in so Teach and Prophecy privatly, or extraordinarily, having extraordinary gifts allowed them for that end (as the Prophetesses did, who are recorded in the Scripture) much less to tell news concerning Christ as the woman of *Samaria* may be supposed to have done? All that we say, is that no women whatsoever ought to discharge the office of Preachers in constituted Churches, ordinarily, and with authority, as men do; and doth not the Apostle to *Timothy*, say the same, where he setteth down several rules and institutions for settled Churches, and among others, forbiddeth all women whatsoever, of such authoritative teaching, because they should be subject, and enjoyns them, if they would learn any thing, to learn it in silence, with all subjection; yea, he interdicteth such teaching to all women, in all ages; for what was written to these particular primitive Churches,

belongs

belongs to all the Churches after them, when there is not a sufficient reason of restricting it, so these two Scriptures are fully vindicated; neither is their objection sufficient which they bring from 1 *Cor.* 11 5. For, 1. Suppose the Apostle did there prescribe rules to women about their Preaching, yet all this will not make it lawful that women should Preach, seing rules are given in Scripture concerning things which were never lawful, but only permitted because of the peoples hardness of heart, as concerning divorce and Polygame under the Law. 2. Some understand this of such women as had any extraordinary gift of Prayer and Prophesie: But, 3. we rather acquiesce to the learned *Joseph Meid*, who, *lib.* 1. *discourse* 16. having rejected all other acceptions of the word *Prophesie*, as not suiting with this Text, shews that *Prophecying* is to be taken for *praising God in Hymns and Psalms*; in which sense it is also taken (as he sheweth) in other places of Scripture, as 1 *Chron.* 25. 1, 2, 3. ——*who prophesied with a Harp, to give thanks, and to praise the Lord*, 2 *Sam.* 10. 5. and 19, 20, &c. and so Prophecying is fitly coupled with Praying, Praying and Praising being the parts of the Christian Worship; which also the Apostle joyns together in the 14. *Chap.* of this *Epist. Vers.* 15. We therefore refer the Reader to the said work for his further satisfaction, and leave it upon our adversaries to impugn this solution. So this Doctrine of the Q. is anti-Scriptural.

§. 41. To conclude therefore, Q. cannot give us any sufficient evidence of their revelations, upon which we may believe them, yea, as we hope, we have abundantly proved, that they have no such revelations from the Spirit of God, and also we our selves have no such thing as these immediat objective revelations; whence it unavoidably follows, that we ought not to believe these revelations for our principal and compleat rule of faith; and consequently they are not such a rule to us, *quod fuit demonstrandum.*

§. 42. Let us now reflect a little upon this Argument, and consider, if it be a Popish weapon, or not? We appeal the judicious and unprejudicate Reader, if it be so. We provoke all the Papists and Quakers in the world to argue against us so, if they can. Do we maintain Enthusiastical revelations? Or suspend we the authority of the Scriptures, either upon them, or the Church? Yet these subdolous Sophists, with whom we have to do, by their subtile misrepresentations, caused some Syllogisms of this Argument to be very like Jesuite *Dempsters* Argumentations against our learned Professor. But we hope, they are sufficiently vindicated now, to our disingenuous adversaries shame and disgrace. Yea, the Argument might be easily inverted against *Romanists*; for they attribute, some of them, to their

Pope,

Pope, and some of them, to their Councils infallibility and Enthusiastical revelations, into which the faith of all Christians should be ultimately resolved, and upon which the authority of Scriptures, according to them, depends; and yet can give no evidence of the same, that is sufficient, even according to themselves, to ground true faith upon; but on the contrary, they have been often convicted of teaching Doctrines directly opposite to the Scriptural revelations of Gods Spirit: So Christ is alwayes crucified between two thieves. We leave the Reader therefore to judge, whether railing *Robin* shew forth more of an Asses, or a Vipers nature, *pag.* 61, where he brands our Argument with the black mark of Popery; and calls it a viperous brood, *&c.*

Section II.

If immediate objective revelations be absolutely necessary to the building up of true Faith?

§. 1. HAving now discussed the first of the two Questions, into which we reduced this the Quakers grand principle of new objective revelations, *viz. If they be the principal and compleat rule of Faith?* We come now to the second, to wit, *if they be absolutely necessary for the building up of true Faith?* Where, 1. a true saving faith is to be understood; for they confess, that the Scriptures, without these new revelations, are sufficient to ground an historical faith in the highest degree, *pag.* 22. *of their account.* 2. These inward revelations are not subjective revelations, or divine illumination; for we assert the necessity of the same; yea, we assert, that divine illumination is requisite for the discerning and understanding immediate objective revelations (seing they may be neglected or rejected) no less, then for understanding mediate objective revelations. 3. The controversie is not about mediate objective revelations, whether Scriptural or Natural; for we likewise admit such, and say, that we ought to receive them into our hearts by faith, and love, and obedience, *&c.* 4. The Question is not, if immediate objective revelations be possible, or be sometimes made to some *de facto*; for we also acknowledge the same, and will be loath to limite Gods power, but if they be necessary, *&c.* 5. The controversie is not so much about immediate revelations of new objects, as about new revelations of the good old things; for though they affirm many particular

things

things relating to our converſation that are not to be found in the Scripture, and therefore, are of neceſſity to be revealed to us immediatly, yet they affirm, that all the eſſentials of Religion are to be found in the Scripture (*pag.* 2, 3. of Mr. *Keiths Immediate Revelation.*

§. 2. And the controverſie is not about outward audible Voices, outward viſible appearances, dreams, night-viſions, tranſes, outward miracles, nor the diſcovery of things meerly in the principle, and Light of reaſon, which agrees to us as we are men (for they plead not for any of theſe as of neceſſary continuance (*Immed Rev. p.* 4.) but 'about the alone Manifeſtations and Revelations, which are given from 'the Lords Spirit, unto the mind of man, in the Seed and Birth of 'God in him (*G. K. p.* 6. 7. of his *immed. Rev. where he defines at 'large*, this Seed to be the Organ, in which Divine and Supernatural things 'are revealed and known, *ſo contradiſtinguiſhing it from the Manifeſta-'tion or Revelation it ſelf* (*look* p. 5. l. 33. *and* p. 6. l. 26. p. 11. l. 11. &c.) 'and to be a ſubſtantial living principle, which hears, ſees, ſmels, taſts 'and feels (*look* p. 6. l. 26. p. 7. l. 1. &c.) and to be of the heaven-'ly, ſpiritual and inviſible ſubſtance of the third Heavens into which '*Paul* was caught, (*p.* 7. l. 20, 21. &c.) and to be ſown out of Hea-'ven into mans heart, and to be formed and watered there, by God 'himſelf, whereby (though it may be hurt and ſlain, by joining with 'the contrary Seed, before it come to its perfect formation) it grow-'eth up into a perfect ſubſtantial Birth of an heavenly and incorrup-'tible Nature, which is Chriſt, formed within the Body of Chriſt, his 'Fleſh and Blood, which cometh down from Heaven; and is ſo called, 'becauſe he dwelleth in it immediatly and communicateth unto man, 'the knowledge of the Beauty and Glory of himſelf, only in and 'through this Seed and Birth, *p.* 7. *l.* 33. &c. *The queſtion then, may 'be formed thus*; whether we ought and may believe the Articles of 'Faith, revealed in the Scriptures, with a ſaving Faith, our under-'ſtandings being inlightned, and our wills renewed, albeit they be not 'immediatly revealed to us, *de novo*, in this Seed and Birth of God? 'Or if new objective immediate revelations made in this Seed and 'Child of God, be ſo abſolutely neceſſar for the building up of true 'Faith, that we neither ought, nor may ſo believe the things contain-'ed in the Scriptures, without theſe revelations; albeit our under-'ſtandings were ſufficiently inlightned to diſcern theſe things, and our 'wills diſpoſed to love and do the ſame? The Q. hold the 2. part, we the firſt.

§. 3. For which, our *Argument* which was the ſecond propoſed on the Stage, runneth thus; if their be no ſuch revelations, as the Q. aſſert, then no revelations are neceſſary, &c. and if their be no ſuch Seed as they aſſert, then there are no ſuch revelations, as they aſſert:

And

And if there be no substantial living principle, which hears, sees &c. in and through which, the Manifestations or Revelations are made, then there is no such Seed as they affere. But this is true, and therefore the rest. There is not substantial living principle, &c. we say for 1. If there were such a good principle, as is substantial, living, &c. then the evil principle or seed, should also be substantial, living, &c. for the same reasons: But this is absurd, for then it should be created by God, and so God should be the author of evil and sin, or it should be uncreated, and consequently it should be God, and so God should be evil, and the evil Seed. 2. This substantial living, good principle, and its seed should be created or uncreated; let them chuse: If uncreated, how can it grow and become a perfect Birth (*non quoad manifestationem tantum*, but a perfect substantial Birth) or be slain, or measured out into greater and lesse measures &c. If created, how can they attribute unto, the incommunicable Attributes of God? How can G. F. call it *the eternal Word which made the Heavens and the Earth* (p. 67. and 56.) *everlasting Father* &c. (p. 53.) and ascribe to it, all the things and names attributed to Christ in the Scriptures, (see his 10. Argument for immediate revelation.) How could *I. Naylor* accept of Divine Worship, upon the accompt of it, and say I accept it, *if ye doit to me, as the light is within me; but I disown it, if ye doit to me as a man?* or to pass by *J. N.* because he hath acknowledged this to be his sin, how could the Q. at *Bristol* in *England* worship him upon the account of the seed within him? or how could 9 chief Quaken (even since *J. N.* his confession) justifie in Print the answers given by these *man-worshippers*, at their judicial examination.

§. 4. To answer, that the seed concretely taken, includes two things, to wit, God, who is eternal, almighty, unchangeable, &c. and the manifestation, which growes, &c. is but a meer shift. For, 1. the dilemma is about the seed, or substantial, living principle, *in and by which the manifestation is given*, as contradistinct from *the manifestation it self*, whether it be created, or uncreated: and however they answer, our instances will return, which we have mentioned. 2. In saying that the manifestation only grows, they deny their principles set down presently but of *Mr. Keeb's* Book, *pag.* 6, 7, 8. where the seed, in and by which this manifestation is made, is affirmed to be a substantial living principle, that grows from less to more, till it become a perfect substantial birth, which is Christ formed in us. And they agree with us in the supposition of these Scripture-phrases, *Christ formed in us, and measure of the Spirit*, &c. for we interpret them all of the manifestations, gifts and graces of the Spirit.

§. 5.

§. 5. To reply, that they hold not the ſeed as contradiſtinct from the manifeſtation, but only the manifeſtation it ſelf to be the ſubſtance, which grows, *&c.* is not to unty the knot; for they affirm the principle, in and by which the manifeſtation is made (or the ſeed it ſelf, as contradiſtinct from the manifeſtation) to be a living ſubſtance which growes, *&c.* 2. The manifeſtation muſt be an accident, and not a ſubſtance; for it hath all the proprieties both eſſential and accidental of an accident, and not of a ſubſtance, it depends not *à ſolo Deo*, it cannot exiſt either in the ſpiritual and inviſible world, or in the natural, viſible, and outward world, without a ſubject, it cannot be without the underſtanding to which it is made; nay, it is but a meer action and *applicatio agentis ad paſſum*, Gods applying himſelf to mans underſtanding, and ſhewing or declaring ſuch things to him. Laſtly, If the manifeſtation be a ſubſtance, whether is it one manifeſtation, or all the manifeſtations, or ſomething common to them all (we had almoſt ſaid, the *idea Platonica* of them) which is a growing ſubſtance.

§. 6. We cannot ſee any way that this can be ſolved, except they retract their anſwers given on the Stage, and acknowledge themſelves to have come ſhort in the Diſpute; and then give us the anſwer which we expected, and they, as it ſeems, did not give, leſt we ſhould have unmaſked them before the people: And it is, that the ſeed (in and by which the revelations are made as contradiſtinct from them) is the eternal Word or Son of God, and ſecond one in the Trinity, united to a heavenly and ſpiritual ſubſtance, which grows, and may be ſlain, or become a perfect ſubſtantial birth, which is *Chriſt formed in us.* So indeed they had ſaid ſomething more plauſibly (for the ſeed might have been eternal, *&c.* in reſpect of the Word, and alſo might have been ſlain, *&c.* in reſpect of this heavenly and ſpiritual nature) and had ſtood to their principles led down by *G. K.* in the fore-cited places, and hinted at by *R. B.* in his *W. M. unmasked*, *p.* 14, 15. But we ſhould have urged them thus: Either the Word of God, the ſecond one in the Trinity, who is every where, has our humane nature conſiſting of a true humane body, and a reaſonable ſoul united to him in the Heavens (either he has a body of the ſame matter, wherewith once he lived upon earth among the Jews, although it be indued with different and ſpiritual qualities, and a rational ſoul united now to him in the Heavens) or he hath it not. If he hath it not, let them confeſs ſo much without equivocation, and declare what they think is become of his body and ſoul, and we ſhall prove that not only Chriſt is man againſt them, but alſo that they in denying it, deny the true Chriſt. But if the eternal *Word* have our humane nature united to him, either they are united Hypoſtatically, and are but one perſon (*i.e.* they are

 united

united so as that all the actions of the one may be attributed to the other) or they are not so united, but are two persons, the one whereof is God, and the other man. If the last, let them confess it, and joyn hands with the *Nestorians*, and we shall prove against both, that Christ is very God, and very man, both in one person, and that they in denying it, deny the true Christ. If the first, how can *Christopher Atkinson*, a chief Q. in *England*, be so angry at *Philip Nye*, *Thomas Godwin*, and *Sidrach Simpson* (set apart by *Cromwel* to draw up some propositions that might be a rule to him, according to which he should tolerate or not tolerate *Sectaries*) for setting down amongst the rest these propositions, *Christ is God*, *Christ is Man*: In answer to the first of which, being their Propos. 6. he exclaims so upon them in his *Sword of the Lord*: *Hear sottish minds, your imagined God beyond the Stars, and your carnal Christ, which ye would make appear through your Heathenish Philosophy, is utterly denied and testified against by the light*, &c.

§. 7. But to speak home to their Answ. 1. It should follow that Christ has three natures, to wit, the Divine, which is every where, the Humane, which the *Heavens must contain till the restitution of all things*, Act. 2. and a heavenly spiritual Nature distinct from both. 2. Christ should have many bodies, one humane in Heaven, and besides it, as many heavenly spiritual bodies, as there are Saints, if not as many as there are and have been men and women. 3. There should be as many Christs as Saints, and one more; for the eternal Word as united to a heavenly body in every Saint, should be a Christ, and, as united to our humane nature in Heaven, another Christ. 4. Christ should die oftener then once properly, contrary to the express testimony of Scripture, (*Heb.* 9. 26.) even as often as there are reprobates (for the union betwixt the eternal *Word*, and this *heavenly created nature*, should be dissolved in them all; or rather as many Christs should die, and when should they rise again from the dead; or should death prevail over them? 5. There is no footstep of this third nature in the Scriptures, nor is there any necessity of it, nor is it consistent with the faith of the Churche in all ages, and in particular, the Council of *Chalcedon*. 6. Either Christ satisfied Gods justice for our sins, or not. If not, confess it, and joyn hands with the *Socinians*. If he satisfied, either it was Christ without (*i. e.* the Word united to our humane nature hypostatically) who satisfied for us, by his outward transactions and sufferings among the Jews, or it is Christ within (*i. e.* the *Word* united to the *spiritual created nature*) who satisfies for us, by his sufferings in us, or both. If the first only, they will contradict (as we conceive) *Pennington* a chief Q. (who in his Quest. *pag.* 25. sayes,

Can-

Can outward blood cleanse the Conscience, &c.) *R.B.* in his *Truth cleared of Calumnies, pag.* 21. and many others of their friends; but they speak the truth in contradicting them. If the second only, they agree with these friends, but they are gross in making Christs sufferings within satisfactory; for either he suffers within willingly, and so he sins, (it being by the sins of man that he suffers, and is crucified within, *Heb. 6. 6. Immed. Revel. pag.* 7. and it being so that he joyns with man) or he suffers against his will, and so he merits not: Again, it should be necessary that every man crucifie the Lord afresh by sin, to the end Gods Justice may be satisfied for his sins; and the outward sufferings at *Jerusalem* should not have been necessary. If they say both, then both these absurdities return on them. Now we leave others to judge whether the Q. deny the true Christ of God, and justle him out by setting up a new Christ to every man in his own breast; and whether hence it doth follow, that there be really no such seed and revelations, and necessity of revelations as the Q. maintain: and so we go on to

§. 8. *Arg.* 2. Which we propound thus. If men have, or may have all that is needful, for grounding the obligation to believe, and do all the things incumbent to them, without such revelations; then such revelations are not absolutly necessary to them, for that end. But the first is true; and therefore the last also. The *Sequel* is uncontrolable: and as to the *minor*: we shall first of all, by this clear and most convincing *Argument*, *ad hominem*, evict, that the very Heathens and Pagans, who never heard the Scriptural revelations, have all that is needful for grounding their obligation to believe, and doe all the things, which according to Q. are incumbent to them, without such revelations. They have the Law of Nature given them from God, which is so intelligible and perspicuous, that having their minds competently fitted and disposed, they may descern and know, both what these revelations are in particular, and also that they are from God, without *Enthusiastical Revelations*, and which, is so full and compleat, that it contains all the things, that according to Q. are necessary to them, whether *necessitate medii* or *necessitate præcepti*: *ergo* they have all. *&c.*

§. 9. But in order to our further prosecution of this Argument, we shall premise these things briefly. 1. by *believing*, here we do not understand, any assent or consent founded upon a revelation, properly so called, but the assent and consent, which they owe to the truths revealed in Nature. 2. By *things necessary*, *necessitate præcepti*, we mean these things, which they are obliged to, *ex officio*; so that they sin formally in the not performing of the same. And by *things neces-*

fary necessitate medii, we understand these things, which are absolutly necessary, to be believed and done by them, being in a lapsed condition, in order to their obtaining of Salvation. Now some things are necessary to be believed, and done by them only *necessitate medii*, as to believe in Christ, to which they are not obliged; because the same is not revealed to them; and yet, they being in a lapsed condition, it is the indispensible mean of their Salvation, and remedy for their sins. Somethings, likewise are necessary only, *necessitate præcepti*; in which things, though they prevaricate, yet they should be saved, if they could believe in Christ and repent. And some things are necessary to them both these ways. 3. It is not necessary, that a Law be drawn up in writ, or expressed in words, but it is sufficient, that it be any fit signification, of the Will of the Rector or Governour, appointing the duty of his Subjects, and determining what benefits shall be done to the obedient, and what punishment to the disobedient, for the ends of Government. All the objective significations *in rerum natura*, in the natures and essences of things, both within us, and without us, of Gods Will concerning Duty, reward and punishment, are the true Law of Nature: and the Way that God doth by nature oblidge, is by laying down such *fundamenta*, from which our duty shall naturally result, as from the signification of his Will; wherefore the Law of nature is unalterable, as long as these *fundamenta* and grounds remain the same. And there is, in the nature of the reasonable Soul, a certain aptitude and disposition to know these things, as soon as they are revealed, that is, as soon as the very *natura rerum* may be observed, wherefore the Law of nature, is also said to be written in the heart; for instance, we are made rational, free Agents, and God is unchangeably our rightfull Governour, of infinite Power, Wisdom and Goodnesse; therefore Gods Nature and ours, compared thus together, are the *fundamentum* from which constantly resulteth our indispensable duty to love and obey God, *&c.*

§. 10. Now we say to our *antecedent*, who will deny that the Heathens have this law of nature? have not they the natures of things, and reasonable souls to consider them? or saith not the Scripture the same with us, *Rom.* 2. 14, 15. *Psal.* 19, 1, 2. *&c.* And is it not as undeniable that this law is given by God, seing he hath revealed and signified the same in the natures of things, which are by him constituted such, that being considered, they ground an intrinsick and essential congruity, and agreeableness betwixt such acts and such objects, for example betwixt love and God, and so make these acts intrinsickly good, and conform to the rational nature. But if all the things that, according

ding

ding to Q. are necessary to Heathens, whether *necessitate medii* or *præcepti*, be found in the Law of Nature, is a greater difficulty, but yet may be soon overcome thus. All the things that, according to Q. are necessary to Heathens, *quovis modo*, are, according to Q. revealed and made known unto them. This we hope will be granted by our adversaries; for they profess and publish the same confidently, and deny the necessity of knowing Christs *Incarnation, Death and Resurrection*, &c. Whence we subsume, but all the things that, are revealed and made known to the Heathens, are to be found in the Law of Nature; *ergo*, all the things that, according to Q. are necessary to Heathens, are to be found in the Law of Nature. The *Major* is beyond all doubt already, and as to the *Minor*, we have given an instance, which serves to confirm the same likewise, to wit, that we should obey and love God, which is a duty resulting from Gods Nature, and our own compared together. An other is that, we should imploy our tongues in the praise and service of God, which is to be a duty incumbent to us by the Law of Nature, is proved from our own Nature, and the use of the Tongue compared with, or related to Gods Nature and Perfections, with his Propriety in us, and all that is ours, and his Government of us. So we prove that Perjury is an hainous Crime, against the Law of Nature, because it is against the Nature of God, and of our speech, and of humane society. We might the same way, run through all the rest of the things revealed unto the Heathens, and demonstrate them from the Nature and Essences of things. But to be short, we refer the reader, for his further satisfaction, to the eminent and judicious M. *Baxter* in *his Reasons* of the *Christian Religion*, p. 69. 70. *&c.* and appeal our *Antagonists* to shew any thing, whatsoever revealed to these Heathens, and (according to Q.) necessary to them any way whatsoever, yea any thing, that is pretended by them to be revealed supernaturally and immediatly, by the Spirit in every man (except the Q. errors) that is not really to be found in the book of Nature. But are these Laws of Nature so perspicuous and intelligible, that they, who have well disposed and fitted minds, may discern and know, both what the same are in particular, and also that they are from God? It is true, all do not alike see all that is written in Gods Statute Book of Nature, albeit written in the same Characters to all; because they have not their minds alike disposed and inlightned, even as all, who have the Scriptural or immediate revelations, do not alike perceive them, because they are not alike disposed and inlightned. But it is as true, that all the things, which (according to Q.) are necessary unto the Heathens *quovis modo*, and revealed unto them, are in the Law of Nature, propounded with a sufficient

clear-

clearneſs and perſpicuity, and may be known, by the very obſerving of the natures of things themſelves. Let any perſon reflect ſeriouſly upon what we have ſaid, and he will find it ſo: or let our *Antagoniſts* pitch upon any of them, that are not ſo, and we ſhall invalidate their attempts.

§. 11. So we conclude that Heathens and Pagans, who never heard the Scriptural revelations, yet have the Law of Nature given them from God, which perſpicuouſly contains all the things, that according to Q. are neceſſary, *quovis modo*, unto them, which was our antecedent; and infers irrefragably, that they have all that, according to Q. is needful for grounding their obligation to believe, and do all the things incumbent to them, without immediate ſupernatural revelations. If they be not oblidged, for what end is ſuch a Law of Nature given unto them by God? Why is it that the *Heavens and the Earth, the Day and the Night* (Pſa. 19.) *uttereth their ſpeech, their line is gone out through all the Earth? &c.* Or how is it, that the *Gentiles are a law to themſelves: which ſhew the work of the Law written on their hearts* (Rom. 2.) *their Conſcience alſo bearing them witneſs &c.* If the Law of Nature did only ſerve to beget in them an Hiſtorical Knowledge, of the things contained in the ſame; then it were ſufficient for them to believe it, hiſtorically as we do, *Titus Livius & quintus Curtius*, which we may, without danger, believe and obey, or totally reject; but are they not ſo oblidged to believe this law, that they ought to obey it as Gods Voice, and will be one day judged by it? So that though the gracious diſpoſing and inlightning of the mind, be abſolutely neceſſary to them, that they may actually perform and obey; yet ſupernatural objective revelation, and the immediate propounding of the things themſelves, is not abſolutely needful for grounding their obligation.

§. 12. Hence it appears, how little ground Q. have to argue, for their revelations, from the witty ſayings and wholſome doctrines, of ſome of the wiſer Heathens. or to ingeminate ſo often to us, *that all men have that in themſelves, which rebukes them for ſin, and that Chriſt convinces the world of ſin*, or to aſſert the neceſſity of objective immediate revelations, to direct us in ſome particular ſteps of our converſations, in which (ſay they) the Scriptures are ſilent: for beſides, that the Scriptures are a compleat rule, both of Faith and Manners, to all that have them, all theſe things may be reſounded on the diſcoveries of Chriſt by nature, and his working by the Conſcience inlightned, in a natural way. In the mean time, we argue thus, only *ad hominem* againſt the Q. in ſo far as we contend, all things neceſſary to the Heathens, *quovis modo*, to be revealed unto them: for we our ſelves,

think

think not that all things needful to them, *necessitate præcepti*, are to be found in the law of Nature, seing they ought to be humbled for original sin, of which, they cannot know so much, as if their be any such thing, from the law of nature, they ought to worship God with some instituted Worship, set apart a determinate proportion of time, for the worship of God &c. which the natures of things can never determine; much less think we, that all things necessary to them, *necessitate medii*, are made known unto them, seing they are ignorant of Christ, and the condition of getting interest in him. We proceed therefore, to a second proof, which doth not only reach Heathens and Pagans, but also includes Christians, and may be formed thus.

§. 13. All men have, or may have the Scriptures, which are inspired by God, and are perspicuous and intelligible, as to all things necessary to salvation, and contain all that they ought to believe and do whatsoever; yea, which are the infallible principal and compleat rule of Faith and Manners to them; and all those they can know without *Enthusiasms*: Therefore, they have all that is needful for grounding the obligation to believe and do all things incumbent to them without *Enthusiasms*. The consequence is irrefragable; for if they have all these, have they not all that Enthusiasms could do, though they had the famine, seing even these could not dispose the mind? And for what end then are Enthusiasms absolutely necessary? Are they not obliged to believe the Scriptures as the Word of God, by which they will be saved, if they keep it, and not only Historically, as *Titus Livius*? &c. The antecedent hath diverse parts; all of which to explain and confirm at length, is no less then superfluous, seing they are so excellently and copiously handled already by *Morney*, *Baxter*, *Wolsley*, &c. in their learned Treatises concerning the *truth and reasonableness of the Christian Religion*, by *Whittaker* in his *Controversies against Stapleton*, by *Chameir* in his *Panstratia Catholica*, *Tillet son* against *Serjeant*, *Camero* in his *Prælect. de Verbo Dei*. To which accurate works, we refer the more inquisitive Reader, for his full satisfaction, and provoke our *scribling adversaries* to confute the same, if they be able. Neither can it be expected that we should insist at large on all these controversies in this small Treatise; we hope it shall suffice us to hint at some things overly for the advantage of those who want time, ability, or occasion to peruse larger Volumes.

§. 14. First of all therefore, that the Scriptures are given from God (or that the Books of the Old and New Testament are the Word and Revelation of God, written by such a special assistance of the Holy Ghost, that the Pen-men thereof could not err) these two Texts of Scripture,

2. *Pet.*

2 Pet. 1. 21. and 2 Tim. 3. 16. may abundantly convince Christians: But that we may meet with others as well as Christians, we shall use this short reason: Either the Scriptures have proceeded from a *good Spirit*, or from an *evil*. Not from an evil; for an evil Spirit would not have delivered the most holy Precepts that ever the world had, backed by the most rational and powerful motives imaginable, nor discovered so wonderful methods, for satisfying Divine Justice, reconciling sinners to God, and pacifying afflicted Consciences, *&c.* as are found in the Scriptures, unless we may think, that Satan overthrows his own Kingdom. But if they have proceeded from a good Spirit, then they have proceeded from God himself; for seing they declare the divine inspiration of themselves so often, and witness themselves to have their arise from God, unless they had God for their Author, they should not be from a good Spirit, but from a lying and cheating spirit, and consequently from an evil one: Seing therefore they are not from an evil spirit, it remains that they draw their origine from the most excellent uncreated Spirit, God, *quod erat demonstrandum.*

§. 15. 2. That the Scriptures contains all things, which they are obliged to believe and do whatsoever, (or that all things necessary for them, whether they be truths, the explicite belief whereof is necessary for salvation, *necessitate medii*, so as without the belief thereof salvation cannot be had, or articles, the belief whereof is [illegible] necessary, *necessitate præcepti*, are expressly revealed in the Scriptures, or deducible by firm consequence, from that which is expressly revealed therein) is easily proved, for, 2 Tim. 3. 15, 16, 17. *The holy Scriptures are able to make wise unto salvation,——and perfect, throughly furnished unto every good work.* And Joh. 20. 31. *They were Written*, for that end, *that we might believe*, &c. And how could they do so, if they did not contain all that is necessary to salvation? If any thing were wanting in the Scriptures, to be supplyed by immediate revelation, then the Scriptures were not able to make wise unto salvation, but only these revelations; which is to contradict the Spirit in the cited Scriptures.

§. 16. 3. That the Scriptures have objective evidence and perspicuity in themselves, as to all things absolutely and indispensably necessary for salvation, and are actually clear to them, who have well disposed faculties, and duely use the means of interpretation, may be proved from 2 Cor. 4. 3, 4. *If our Gospel* (that is, the outward Gospel which was preached by the Apostles, and is contained in the Scriptures) *be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath blinded their minds.* And also from the places cited already for the perfection of the Scriptures, 2 Tim. 3. Joh. 20. For if the Scriptures were not thus per-

perſpicuous and intelligible as well as perfect, how could they accompliſh theſe ends, *viz.* work faith in us, and guide us to eternal life? But to ſearch out our *Antagoniſts* further, we *querie* them, if a perſon may have immediate objective revelations, who hath not his mind well diſpoſed? And if ſo, what advantage would he have by them, which he might not have without them by the Scriptures? Would not both have one objective evidence in themſelves? and yet neither of them be actually underſtood or accepted, without divine illumination? Would not both be alike of a divine extract? alike compleat? and alike binding? And if they would not be alike in theſe things, what can be the reaſon of the diſparity? But if a perſon cannot have ſuch revelations, without a good diſpoſition of mind, would not all then be well diſpoſed, according to them, who maintain that all have ſuch revelations? Again, may a perſon be well diſpoſed, who hath not ſuch revelations? If he may, what need is there of ſuch revelations? May he not believe the Scriptures without them? But if he cannot be well diſpoſed without ſuch revelations, whether is the impediment on Gods part, who will not, or cannot (*abſit blaſphemia*) thus diſpoſe the ſoul without them? or is it on the ſouls part, as being of its own nature incapable of ſuch a diſpoſition without them?

§. 17. We proceed to the 4. particular, and that the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament are the principal, compleat and infallible rule of Faith and Manners (the adequat and chief ſtandard or meaſure, by which we are to judge of all the Articles of faith, and Actions of Life; or the examplary directive cauſe, according to which we ought to live and believe) we evict by two proofs; The firſt whereof is, that the Scriptures are able to make wiſe unto ſalvation, *and are profitable for doctrine, for conviction, for reproof, and for inſtruction in righteouſneſs, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furniſhed into every good work*, as is fully holden out in that luculent Scripture, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15, 16, 17. *Ergo* the Scriptures are ſuch a compleat, principal and infallible rule of Faith and Manners. The great cavil uſed againſt this proof by *R. B.* p. 29. of his *Calumnies*; and alſo by *G. K.* p. 126. of his *Immed. Revel.* is, that the Scriptures are only thus profitable and able to make wiſe and perfect him, who hath them given him, *de novo*, by immediate objective inſpiration, as they had, who wrote them; but cannot of themſelves accompliſh any ſuch thing without theſe inſpirations. But for refutation hereof, Firſt, In that caſe the Scriptures ſhould not make wiſe unto Salvation, nor perfectly inſtruct in every good work, but only theſe revelations; the Scriptures ſhould not make any wiſe, or perfect, but find them

made such already; yea, the Scriptures should not be profitable at all, for that end, as we have made out at more length already, in the 2. *Arg.* of our first *Sect.* 2. It being so expressly affirmed here by the Spirit of God, that the Scriptures are thus profitable, and able to make wise unto salvation, the Scriptures of necessity must be sufficient for that end, either, *in omni genere causæ*, and altogether, or *in aliquo genere causæ*, and by way of some particular cause. Now, who will assert that the Sciptures are sufficient every way, and so as to exclude the inward efficiency of of the Spirit, and the concurrence of other causes? we indeed acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit, to be necessary for making wise unto salvation, and so we make the Spirit the efficient cause of Faith; but nevertheless, we also teach, that the Scriptures are able to make wise unto Salvation, *suo genere viz.*, by way of a rule or examplary objective cause. But if the Scriptures could not be profitable or make wise unto Salvation, without immediate objective inspirations (as our anti-scriptural adversaries would have) they should not be able to make wise unto Salvation, *in ullo genere causæ*, in any kind of cause whatsoever, for alwayes they should stand in need of the help and subsidy of these inspirations.

§. 18. As for the rest of *G. K.* his whimsies, whereby he laboureth to shift this clear Truth, they are all very bare and naked; and some of them impertinent; for though God has promised to write his Law upon the hearts of his people, and there be also many writtings that are not dictated by the Spirit of God, yet it is only the Books of the old and new Testament, which are called the Scripture, κατ' ἐξοχην, by way of excellency, and the word (Scripture) as in other places, so here it denots these Books, even as the *Apostle* κατ' ἐξοχην denots *Paul* and the *Philosopher Aristotle*, we had almost added, the *Sophist* may signifie *M. George Keith*, and the *railer*, *R. Barclay*, The substantive Verbe (is) or the like, is not indeed to be found in the whole 16. v. in the original, which runs thus, πᾶσα γραφη θεοπνευστος και ὠφελιμος προς διδασκαλιαν &c. And consequently in the Expositon is to be put in, for making up the sense, in some place. But none except a *Quaker*, as *G. Keith*, or a *Jesuite*, as *Serrarius*, will take it in, after these words (*given by inspiration of God*) for they are joined with the word (profitable) by the conjunction (and) and so, if the verb were taken in there, the reading would be ridiculous. It remains therefore, that it be put in, before both these adjuncts, and the words be rendred thus (*all the Scripture is given by inspiration of God &c.* Now the Scripture is not simply profitable, but also able

to make wise unto Salvation through Faith, which is in Jesus Christ." (through Faith, we say not as an objective cause, but as the instrument, which applies the Scriptures; for the Scripture is said to be able to make wise unto salvation, not συνεργως with Faith, but διὰ πίστεως through Faith.) The Scripture is useful for Doctrine, conviction, reproof and instruction in righteousness (that is, for every good work, as *Paul* himself expones it) they are so profitable that the man of God may be perfect, that is, the *Minister of Christ* may be every way fitted for the work of his calling; for though any man, led by the Spirit of God (as is well observed by *M. Mitchel*, In his *sober answer*, p. 39.) may in a large sense, be called the man of God; yet the Lord in the Scriptures, attributes this Title in a peculiar way to his *Ministers*; and if the Scriptures have enough in them, to instruct the Ministers perfectly in every part of their duty, who are to know beyond others, and to teach others, then *à fortiori*, they have enough in them to direct others sufficiently. And if some of the Scriptures could accomplish that, while some other parts were not as yet written: much more will they now, altogether be sufficient for the same. And so all the Cob-webs of this restless Spider are sweept to the ground.

§. 19. But our 2. *proof for the Scriptures, being the foresaid rule*, is this; that according to which, we will be judged in the last day, is our foresaid rule (or law) of Faith and Manners, according to which, we ought to live and believe. But the Scripture is that, according to which we will be judged in the last day. *Ergo*, the Scripture is our foresaid rule, or law, *&c. The first Proposition* is clear, from the Nature of God, who would never oblidge us to live and believe, according to one rule and law, and judge us by another. The *assumption* is proved from *John* 12. 48. The Word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day, that is, not the Eternal and uncreated Word Christ, but the Word spoken by Christ, and rejected by the Jews, which is now contained in the Scripture, and cannot judge otherwayes, then as a rule or law, and from *Rom.* 2, 12. *as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law*, That is the written law; for it is such as the Jews had, but the Gentiles were without, the Jews boasted of, and is opposed to the law of nature, and the testimony of the Conscience: whence we reason thus; if they who sin under a written law, shall be judged by a written law, then they who have the Scripture, and sin under it, shall be judged by the same; for it is a written law: But the first is true, from what hath been said, and therefore the last.

§. 20. Our last particular, to wit, that we can know all these things,

without Enthusiastical revelations, is also established sufficiently by this time; for we have given a specimen of proofs for them, from Reason and Scripture, without any subsidy or help of such revelations: Therefore we are sufficiently obliged to all the things incumbent to us. *So, a primo ad ultimum*, these revelations are not absolutely necessary to Christians and others, who have heard the Scriptures, nor to Heathens and Pagans, who never heard the same, for grounding their obligation to believe and do the things incumbent to them. And now, having, as we hope, abundantly confuted, not only the *Quakers* grand principle of immediate objective revelations: but also several others of their impious Tenets, we shall in the next place convase some more of their errors, which depend upon these Enthusiastical revelations, to wit, these concerning the Worship of God, and the Sacraments, the Ministry, and the power of Magistrats, these being most gross, and more peculiar to the Q. and in order hereto, we inscribe one.

Section III.

If previous sensible Inspirations to Duty, be necessarily prerequired as our warrand, for the performance of the same?

§. 1. THe 11. Thesis contains their declaration, concerning this particular, in these words; *as to the outward signification of Worship in Prayers, Praises and Preaching, we ought not to do it, when and where we will, but when and where we are moved thereunto, by the secret inspirations of his Spirit in our hearts*, where they have involved up the controversie under ambigous expressions; and therefore we will state it *de novo*.

§. 2. First of all then, the question is not only concerning outward performances (though it be ordinarily moved by the Q. concerning them only) but also, as we are to shew afterwards, concerning the inward performances, as the desires of the heart in prayer, &c. 2. The Question is not only about Duty on the matter, *viz.* the act of Prayers, &c. as separated from the right manner, *viz.* Sincerity and Truth &c. But seing the command of God obligeth to both, the Question must be about the performing of that, which is Duty on the matter, in a right and spiritual manner: Whether a person be ob-

obliged to pray, in such a case, in spirit and truth; not if he be obliged to pray formally and hipocritically. 3. The Question is not about every performance, but about acceptable performance, not about the possibility of performance: whether we may perform without such motions of the Spirit (for both parties confess, its possible that the outward part may be so gone about) but about the obligation and lawfulness of it, whether we ought, be obliged, and may lawfully so perform. 4 The question is not about a common motion of the Spirit (for who will deny that this is necessary, seing in him, we live, move and have our beeing) nor 5. about the command of the Spirit. It is indeed controverted betwixt them and us, whether we are oblidged by vertue of the Scripture-precepts, to pray, &c. in a spiritual manner, unless we have an inward immediate call thereunto? Or if the Scripture-precepts be sufficient without such a call. But the present controversie is not about this call, nor 6. about the knowledge or conviction of Duty: we indeed make this so necessary, that we say ignorance, when there are [illegible] means of knowledge, excuseth neglecters of duty, *a tanto*, and invincible ignorance, *a toto*, but the Q. beyond this knowledge and conviction, which is common to the wicked and unregenerate, require something further, which is peculiar to godly and acceptable worshipers; so that the question is not about knowledge, or conviction of Duty precisly, nor 7. about inclination to Duty precisly, which also may be some way in the unregenerate, where there is knowledge and conviction of Duty, and not only in acceptable worshippers, as that is, which the Q. require here, nor 8. about a new heart, and spiritual principle of obedience (for we own it as indispensably necessary, for acceptable performance: Seing a corrupt Tree cannot bring forth good Fruit) nor 9. *about the gracious assisting influences of the Spirit*, in the actual performance of Duty; for we grant, that no act of worship can be acceptably performed, without these influences, 1 *Cor.* 12. 3. *Joh.* 15. 5. 2 *Cor.* 3. 5. *Rom.* 8. 26, 27.

§. 3. Neither 10, is the Question, if a special disposition and fitness for duty previous in time be vouchsafed sometimes; for we are so far from denying this, that we esteem it a great mercy. So that to be brief, the question is not about any thing needful in a person to qualifie him for, or help him in the acceptable performance of the duty, to which he is already oblidged: But about preparatory motions and impulses of the Spirit, or a lively suitable frame of heart *felt previous in time*, as our ground and warrand to duty. The question then comes to this, *Whether we are obliged by vertue of Scripture pre-*

precepts to pray, praise, &c. in a spiritual manner, although we feel not in our hearts, such a lively and spiritual disposition and frame for duty, before we set out to it? Or if such motions and impulses of the Spirit to duty, previous in time to the performance thereof, be necessarily required as our warrand to it, so that if we feel not these, for some time before we set out to it, we are not oblidged to set about it; yea, and ought to abstain from prayer, praise, &c. till we feel these motions.

§. 4. The Q. hold the 2, part of this question, and maintain, that if we feel not special and gracious influences, motions and inspirations of the Spirit upon our hearts before that we set out to duty, and consequently have them previous in time (how short while soever it be) before the duty, we are not oblidged to go about it, but ought to abstain from it, under the pain of committing the sins of *idolatry, will-worship, formality*, &c. and to wait till we feel the foresaid motions, and then set out to duty.

§. 5. We on the other hand, hold the first part of this Question, and maintain, that we are sufficiently oblidged by the *Scripture-precepts* to go about duty, although we feel not such a lively and spiritual frame and disposition of heart for duty, before we set out to it; but are also oblidged to go about it in a spiritual manner, and not hypocritically: so that if we go about it formally and hypocritically, we sin (not upon the account of the matter, because we go about commanded duty, (*v.g.*) because we seek forgivenness of sins) but upon the account of the manner, because we go about it formally and hypocritically, not in spirit and truth) and if we abstain altogether from duty, we sin doubly, both upon the account of the manner and matter, both because we go not about duty, and also because we go not about it in spirit and truth. We ought likewise to keep our hearts still in a praying and worshipping frame, according to the Scriptnre-commands, 1 *Thess.* 5. 17. *Eph.* 6. 18. and therfore, not only in duty, but also in the intervals of duty, ought to wait and depend on God for the constant supplies of his Spirit, to keep our hearts in a spiritual and lively frame; (yea, and ought to wait for his gracious influences to inable us to the acceptable performance of the very duties of our callings and relations;) and in case that we wait not so, yet our sinful not-waiting, exeems us not from the obligation of Scripture-commands; but if we abstain from duty upon that account, our abstaining likewise should be sinful: yea, for solemn duties, when time is allowed, we should prepare, meditate, judge our selves, look up to God, and depend on him for a prepared heart, *&c.* But in some cases *we may and ought*, although indisposed, set out to prayer, (for example) as in some imminent danger, or when a duty cannot be omit-

ted

ted without scandal to others, or cannot be performed afterwards; yet even then, and not only then, but alwayes, when we set about duty, we ought to go about it, in obedience to the Scripture-commands, exercising faith on Christ, relying on his Word, looking up to, and waiting on God for his special influences, and gracious assistance in *duty*, which is indispensably necessary to acceptable performance, and may be expected in *duty*, by them, who thus act faith in Christ and his Word of promise, though they had no lively frame, and spiritual disposition of heart, before their setting out to duty.

§. 6. The Question being thus stated, and the answers of both Parties given in to it, we propound our *Argument*, 1. Against this pernicious error (which was the third of these agitated on the Stage) thus. If we should not go about Religious actions, without a previous sensible (or foregoing felt) influence of the Spirit and disposition: Then, neither should we go about the other actions of our lives and conversations, without a previous sensible influence *&c.* But this is absurd: and therefore that also. This is absurd, we say; for then we should not honour the *King*, eat, pay debt, plowgh, *&c.* till we felt such a previous influence and disposition, and so should expose our selves to imprisonment, killing, starving, we would be hated of all men, and deprive our selves of all the benefits of incorporation and society, *&c.* We prove the *Sequel* thus, the same reasons, that would infer a previous sensible inspiration and disposition, to be necessary, for grounding our obligation to religious Actions, would infer the same to be necessary, in order to all our actions whatsomever: for as it is said, *the prayer of the wicked is abomination to the Lord*; so it is said, *the plowing of the wicked is sin*: and as it is said, *pray in the Spirit*; so it is said, *walk ye in the Spirit, do all to the glory of God, whatsoever is not of faith is sin*: and as it is said, *we know not what to pray for, as we aught*, &c. so it is said, *it is not in man to direct his steps aright.*

§. 7. R. B. In his *rejoynder* to *Mr. Mitchel*, p. 58. and *Al. Sk.* In his *questions concerning worship*, deny this sequel, because there is as real a difference betwixt *spiritual and other duties*, as betwixt *Angels* and *Brutes*. Spiritual duties being immediatly related to God, and their end being unattainable without the help of the Spirit: whereas we may and ought to do other things as men. To which we *reply*, that, as there is a real difference betwixt *Angels* and *Brutes* in some things, so there is between *Spiritual duties and other actions* in some things; but yet as *Angels* and *Brutes* agree in that they are both substances, so spiritual duties and other duties agree in that they are both to be performed in the Spirit,

&c.

&c. and consequently, If we should not set about the one, without a previous sensible impulse, because we should do the same in the Spirit, &c. then neither should we set about the other, without a sensible previous impulse, because we should do that also in the Spirit, &c. we might add, that natural and civil duties, cannot obtain their end without the help of the Spirit, (for we should do all things to the glory of God, 1 Cor. 10. 31) and we should go about them not as men meerly, but as men fearing God, &c. But we proceed, *Al. Sk.* giveth other two *answers* (*ibidem*) the one of which is an impudent calumny; for we do not infer going about spiritual duties in a carnal manner from going about natural and civil actions in a spiritual manner, but only we shew the absurdity of the Q. principle, by the consequence above written: and his other *answer* is a clear confession and owning of the thing that was charged on them.

§. 8. But here, *G. K.* dissenteth from his pretended infallible brethren (for he requireth inspirations to other actions, no less then to religious duties, being engaged thereto by the places of his Book cited in the dispute) & not only so, but likewise differeth from himself: for, as we have proved already, he gave in one distinction upon the Stage, and, as it seems, seing the unsufficiency thereof, has, in the account, placed an other in its room: upon the Stage he distinguished between *mandatory inspirations* (which he makes needful to religious actions) and *permissory inspirations* which he makes necessary to other actions. *Against* this distinction we argued, 1. that there is no ground for it in the Scriptures, which speak nothing of permissive inspirations.

§. 9. *G. K.* produces two Scriptures, the one whereof is, *Acts* 16. 7. *Paul essayed to go into Bythinia, but the Spirit permitted him not*; the sense whereof he admitteth to be, that the Spirit interdicted and hindered him, but would from it be inferring, by the rule of contraries, that the spirit permitted him at other times, and that this permission was by inspiration. For reply to which we agree with him concerning the sense of the Texts, but we simply deny his inference from the same, which is altogether precarius, and may be infringed several wayes; for first *he permitted him and he permitted him not are not contraries*, as one who is scarcely entered into the *Logick* schools can demonstrate; How then can *G. K.* who is a *master of Arts* go about to infer by the rule of contraries that because the Spirit permitted him not at some times, therefore he permitted him at other times, &c. Either *G. K.* has forgotten his Logicks, or he baffles them to patronize his delusions. But 2. let us see if this inference will follow, by the rule of *contradictories*. By permitting may be understood either simple permitting, or that which is joyned with a command, and which soever of them be understood in this sequel, it will not sustain. If the

first

first, it is invalid; for the *Spirit* might at some times *not permit or forbid Paul*; and yet, at other times not simply permit, but *command* him. If the second be understood, it is also null; for he might at sometimes *not permit, (or forbid;)* and yet, at other times not *command*, but simply *permit* him. However, we grant, that the permitting of him joyned with a command, might have been by inspiration, which yet is no ground for inspirations meerly permissory, as contradistinct from mandatory; but we simply deny that the simple permitting of him hath been by inspiration, and leave it to be proved by *G. K.*

§. 10. The other Scripture produced by this Sophist is, 1 Cor. 7. 6. where *Paul* writing Scripture by inspiration, saith, *I speak this by permission, and not by commandment*; compared with *vers.* 40. We marvel not a little that he desires us to compare it with *vers.* 40. for in it there is no mention of permitting. Shall we say, that the Q. joyns issue with the *Socinians*, and denyes the *Scripturia* and divine inspiration of some parts of the Scripture; for this Text could be objected against us only in that case, and is fully vindicated by our Divines, and in particular by *Fr. Spanhemius, part. 3. dub. Evangel. p. 95.* But passing by this, because it is not expresly owned by them, we answer briefly to the 6. *vers.* that the words have a reference to the thing going before, for it is said, *I speak this*, to wit, *that married persons might with consent deny each other due benevolence for a time*, &c. or else as others would have it, *that every man should have his own wife, and every woman her own husband*; which of themselves are matters of indifferency, and *Paul* doth not strictly command to be done, but only as they please, and have gifts, for it is said, *except perhaps it be with consent*, &c. *and for shunning of fornication, let every man*, &c. after which *Paul* subjoyns these words, in the 6. *vers.* left he should be thought to command the fore-going things strictly to all persons, without exception. But he himself was inspired and commanded to speak and permit this: so that the permission falls upon the thing spoken, and not upon the speaking it self: And so we have gotten no sufficient ground for their distinction out of the Scripture.

§. 11. *We argue*, 2. against these permissory inspirations thus: If permission be inspiration, then a stone can permit, which is absurd: *G. K.* distinguisheth here between privative permission (which a stone can give) and a positive permission, which may be an inspiration. In assigning a ground for which distinction out of the Scripture, and explaining it by examples; this great inspired *Rabbi* was very unfortunate upon the Stage (though it be not a very difficult work) as may be seen in our account. But to discover how impertinently this distinction

stinction was made use of here, we reason thus: If positive permission were inspiration, then a man might inspire us, no less then God, for he might positively permit and allow us to do such a thing. We hope then *M. Keith* will be necessitated to return to his Bagge for a new distinction, since this is rendred useless; as for us, we know not what can be reponed to us here, except a retortion, which, because its solution will give much light in this matter, we shall discuss briefly thus. If commanding were inspiration, then men might inspire us, for they might command us. But commanding is inspiration according to you (may our adversaries say) *ergo*, to which, we answer, that inspiration, according to us, is not meer and simple commanding (else the retortion should hold) but it is the inclining of the will, and carrying us out so to the thing inspired, that we must of necessity (*ex fœdi quadam necessitate*) set about it, which prompting out, though it hath not always a formal and explicite command accompanying it, yet it includes a virtual command, and is equivalent to the strictest precept immaginable, and is utterly inconsistent with simple permission, whether negative or positive whence.

§. 12. We *Argue* 3*dly*. against permissive inspiration thus. Either God by this permissive inspiration, prompts out unavoidably, and so commands virtually, or he doth neither prompt out so, nor command at all. If he does put out and command so, then it is not a meer and simple permission, as *G. K.* would have it, for he contradistinguishes permissive inspirations from mandatory: If he does not put out, nor command at all, then it is not an inspiration at all, which we instruct thus. Every inspiration puts us out necessarily to the doing of the thing inspired, and so commands us virtually, but a meer permitting of us to do what we please, without either commanding or forbidding of us, doth not so: *Ergo*, it is not an inspiration. *The* 2. *proposition* is evident, and we clear the *first* thus. The word imports a *breathing within us*, or a *[illegible]*, both in the Greek and Latine: and the Q. themselves explain inspiration by *Guiding*, *Leading*, *Drawing*, *moving*, *Diffusing*, *Influencing*, &c. Yea, and Inspiration includes in its notion, an insuperable putting and prompting out to the thing inspired, in all Authors, both sacred and prophane. *Virgil* sayes of the inspired *Sybil* lined 6, *Bacchatur vates, magnum si pectore possit excussisse Deum* (not unlike our Q. in their extatical fits) *Ovid* sayes of *Poets* (as he alledges inspired) *fastorum lib. 6. est Deus in nobis agitante calescimus illo: impetus hic sacræ semina mentis habet. Balaam Num* 22. sayeth *I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord* &c. And the Apostle *Peter* 2 *Epist.* 1. c. 21. v. sayeth of the Prophets Inspired, that they were [illegible], moved and carried forth by the *Holy Ghost*

(see

(see 1 *Sam.* 10. 10. 1 *King.* 22. 22. *Mat.* 9. 18, 20.) We doubt whether the word of the Lord which came to *Jonah* (Jon. 1. 1.) was an Inspiration, or a meer Command; but however, he could not defeat nor avoid the same, though he could resist it.

§. 13. But 4. Suppose, that a previous sensible Inspiration, were necessary to oblidge us to the common and ordinary actions of our lives and conversations, and that there were permissory Inspirations; yet in that case, a permissory Inspiration should not be sufficient for Duties: for that Inspiration, which leaves us undeterminate to this or the other extreame, should not be sufficient for *Duties*; yea, it is inconsistent with them, because they determine us to one extream. But permissory Inspiration is such; therefore it should not be sufficient *&c.* 5. If a previous, sensible, mandatory Inspiration be necessary to warrand and oblidge us to religious actions; because it is said, *pray in the Spirit* &c. Then a previous sensible, mandatory Inspiration should be necessary also, to warrand and oblidge us to all our actions, because it is said *walk in the Spirit &c.* And on the other hand, if only a previous sensible, permissory Inspiration were needful for our other Actions, because it is said *walk in the Spirit* &c. Then a previous, sensible, permissory Inspiration, only were needful for our religious Actions, because it is said, *pray in the Spirit.*

§. 14. And 6. The absurdities mentioned in the beginning of the Argument still recurres; for if a previous, sensible Inspiration, whether commanding or only permitting, were necessary to oblidge us to the actions of our Lives, then we are not oblidged to honour the King, pay Debt, Eat or Plow, &c. till we feel such an Inspiration: yea, suppose a man had such an Inspiration for these things, yet he might deny to do them, and pretend, that he had not such an Inspiration, which if he did, who could control him?

§. 15. *G. K.* Finding himself beset with these inextricable difficulties, as it seemes, misplaces this distinction in their account, and gives in an other distinction, for solving of this Argument, to wit, of *particular* Inspirations (which he makes needful to religious actions) and *general* Inspirations, which he accompts needful, to other actions also. But either the same, or as great difficulties recurre alway upon him. For 1. He shall never be able to produce a ground for this distinction out of Scripture. He may indeed easily find a ground in the Scripture for general, or rather common and special motions and concurses of the Spirit, whereby he concurres in way of providence variously, with various creatures: But these are not Inspirations, nor felt as such before our actions be gone about. 2. That which is

called a general Inſpiration, could not put us out to any particular thing. 3. It would not be ſufficient for particular Duties, but inconſiſtent with them; for they ſhould alwayes leave us undetermined. So the 5. and 6. Argumentations againſt permiſſive Inſpirations, may be eaſily applyed here: and what can be anſwered to any of theſe Argumentations, we can ſcarcely conjecture, except it be, that no man can be ſuppoſed to want permiſſive Inſpirations, or general Inſpirations which may be anſwered only to ſome of them, and ſhall be canvaſſed preſently in our,

§. 16. *Argument* 2. againſt this error, which was the propounded on the ſtage, and may be formed thus. If we ought not to ſet forth to outward Duties, without a previous, ſenſible Inſpiration and Diſpoſition, then neither ought we to go about inward Duties, without a previous, ſenſible Inſpiration and Diſpoſition. But this laſt is abſurd; and therefore the firſt. We prove the Sequel, for both are religious Actions, and the Scriptures, produced here by our adverſaries, ſerve alike to prove both, and are not reſtricted to outward Duties. Yea, the inward Duties (ſuch as the hearts deſireing of grace, mental praying, waiting, meditating &c.) require ſuch a diſpoſition and motion of the Spirit, rather then outward performances; for it is the inward, upon which the acceptance doth chiefly depend, and in which the gracious aſſiſtance and influences of the Spirit are requiſite, and gold deſires in the heart &c. are worſe then formal expreſſions in the mouth &c. But the aſſiſtance of the Spirit is requiſite for the outward performance, as contradiſtinct from the aſſiſtance requiſite for the inward performance, is but aſſiſtance, for the exerciſe of a common gift, as of utterance, whereof there may be more, when the acceptance is leſs; and in publick, is more required for the edification of others, then for acceptance with God. In order to this aſſiſtance, the Spirit worketh by giving utterance, increaſſing it by his bleſſing upon induſtry, and helping us to exerciſe it: which may be the better exerciſed, the more natural parts, and induſtry there be. So that induſtry, and natural parts are not to be laid aſide, but ſanctified and exerciſed ſpiritually; and this aſſiſtance to utterance, is not in ſuch a ſenſe immediate, as to exclude ſubſervient means and endeavours, without which, we are not to expect it now, more then the gift of Tongues. But to return, we prove our *Minor* thus, If a previous ſenſible, lively and ſpiritual diſpoſition of heart, were neceſſary to inward duties, then we neither ought nor could wait, deſire grace or any good, pray in our minds, meditate, &c. except we waited a-before, for this previous inſpiration and diſpoſition, and we neither ought, nor could wait a-before, for this previous inſpiration and

diſpo-

disposition; except we waited yet a-before for another, and so *in infinitum*.

§. 17. G. K. distinguishes here between general inspirations (which are sufficient to warrand and oblidge us to inward duties) and particular inspirations, which are required to outward duties; adding that no man can be supposed to want general inspirations for waiting, desiring, &c. at any time whatsoever, nor to want particular inspirations for particular duties, when ever the season cometh of going about them. *But for reply* 1. There are no general inspirations, as we have shewed already, 2. Suppose that a previous, sensible inspiration were needful to all our religious actions, and that there were general inspirations, yet they being but general, would not be a sufficient ground for the particular inward duties, of waiting desiring, meditating, &c. 3. The Scriptures, produced by the ℚ: do prove alike as to outward, and as to inward duties.

§. 18. And, 4. An Heretick forbearing prayer a year or two, or his whole life time, may justify himself by this doctrine: Whether he should have ground from the ℚ: principle, we do not say *Now*, but this we say, he may forbear it so long, and when he hath done so, alledge that he was not oblidged to pray, because he had not an impulse, without which his prayer would have been idolatry, and who among our adversaries can convince him of a lie? To say that particular influences cannot be wanting Neither for one year, nor for any time, that the particular duties ought to be gone about, is a notable shift; for they suspend likewise the times of going about duties, upon these calls of the Spirit, so that the Heretick may pretend that he had received no inspiration for prayer, all that time he abstained from prayer; and by what reason shall the ℚ: prove him guilty and deceitful? yea, they have added another excuse for him (p. 38. of their account) to wit *all have not utterance to pray in words*, &c. for may he not say then, that he wanted this utterance.

§. 19. But 5. all have not these general inspirations for inward duties at every time; and some there are, who have not particular inspirations at all, for the proof of this, first we appeal to common experience: do all find alwayes one inspiration for desiring grace or pardon of sin, for meditating; waiting, &c. will the ℚ: say its not necessary, that these general influences be felt, and that we may and ought to go about inward duties, although we feel not these general inspirations? We argue thus; It is as great a sin to set about mental prayer, &c. when we feel no inspiration, as it is to set about outward prayer, &c. when we feel no inspiration; and the Scriptures, produced by the ℚ: prove as well that a sensible, previous inspiration is needful to inward, as to outward duties. Yea, we appeal to all if they *feel not themselves often indisposed* for desi-

ring

ring pardon of sins, meditating, &c. We doubt not, but our very adversaries can truly declare this, if they will. And again, do all feel particular inspirations for outward duties at particular seasons? None pretend to them except Q: and we are perswaded that they either lie and cheat us, or else they are deluded themselves, by an evil spirit.

§ 20 But secondly, feel they or have they any inspirations whether general or particular for any duties whether outward or inward, *who are in a state of desertion* and forsaking of God, *or they who have despared* of obtaining mercy, *or they who, by their not waiting and other sins, have forefeised these inspirations*, and provoked the Lord to give them up to hardness of heart? doth not R. B. in *his Calumnies*, p. 69. say that *W. M.* is wholly unacquainted with the ways and motions of the Spirit? Have not Q. declared to people of our profession, that *T. M.* on a certain Lords day, when his wife was at Church, prayed in his house with some of his servants, to their admiration, and essayed to do the like the next day about the same hour, and in the same place, but could not then, nor twelve moneths thereafter, for want of the Spirits motion. We conclude this Argument with this *Querie*, *Are these persons oblidged to go about duties seing they have not these inspirations and dispositions? Or sin they in omitting the same?*

Section IV.

If Baptism with Water be an ordinance of Jesus Christ, to be continued in his Church to the end of the world.

§. 1. *The state of the Question* is not, whether Baptism ought to be by sprinkling or dipping into water, or whether infants ought to be baptized, or whether any persons should be re-baptized, or who have the power of administring baptism, *&c?* But whether baptism with water be an ordinance of Christ to be continued in his Church to the end of the world, or if it be neither an ordinance of Christ, nor lawful? The Q. hold the second part of the Question, we the first, and we argue thus, as we did on the Stage, in the end of our solemn Dispute.

§. 2. Baptism with water is to continue in the Church as long as Christs presence is to continue with his Apostles, and them who teach the doctrine that they taught: but Christs presence is to continue with his Apostles, *&c.* to the end of the world; and *therefore* baptism with water also. The *second proposition* is not denyed; and we prove the first from Mat. 28. 19, 20. where Christ commands them to baptize all nations,

nations, and teach them to observe whatsoever he commanded them, and promises to *be with them to the end of the world*: which baptism we prove to be baptism with water.

§. 3. *First of all, thus*: If the Apostles did practise Baptism with water after this command and promise, then this baptism is baptism with water. But the first is true, and therefore the last. The *minor* is manifest, we prove the *sequel* thus: If the Apostles did practise baptism with water, and yet the same be not commanded here, then either they mistook the meaning of this command, and really had no command, or else they had another command from Christ for it: But neither of these can be said. Not the first, for the Spirit led the Apostles into the knowledge of all truth; nor the second, for it were to render up the cause: *Therefore*, neither can the thing be said, whence one of these would follow. *G. K.* answers, that they neither mistook this, nor had another command to baptize with water, but did so in *condescendency* to the Jews weakness. Against which we give this 1. *Reason*, Then they should have baptized with water of their own will, and without any sufficient authority; which is absurd.

§. 4. *Our adversaries* retort this upon *Pauls* circumcising *Timothy*, to which we give this *Answ.* (some parts whereof are cited out of S. *Augustine*, by *G. K. p.* 47. of their *Pamphlet*) that circumcision is to be considered under a threefold respect: First, as living under the Law, when it was observed upon the account of the command, *Gen.* 17. Secondly, As dead after the death of Christ, by which the obligation of that command was taken away, as is manifest from *Acts* 15. throughout, *Col.* 2. 14, *&c.* and circumcision left as a thing indifferent to be practised or not practised, as the glory of God, good of the Church, *&c.* did require. Thirdly, As deadly sometime thereafter, being once buried and forbidden, as is most manifest from *Gal.* 5. 1, 12, *&c.* Now in the second difference of time, *Paul* circumcised *Timothy, because of the Jews* (*Acts* 16.) but not without a command; for the law of charity, and other general precepts, oblidged *Paul* to do so, though it was a thing indifferent of it self, and also he had the infallible assistance of the Spirit, being an Apostle; neither would he have ventured upon a thing of so great moment, of his own head, and self-will, nor did he circumcise *Titus* out of condescendency, or any other that we read of in Scripture. The like whereof cannot be said of Baptism with water. Will *G. K.* grant that it was once lively, or where will he shew the disanulling of the command to baptize so? Saith the Scripture any where, that the Apostles baptized with water out of condescendency, or where is this baptism buried and forbidden? Did not the Apostles baptize whole families and thousands together;

gether; yea, and make the profession of faith in Jesus Christ the condition of this baptism (*Acts* 2. 38, 41. *Acts* 8. 37. *Acts* 10. 47, 48. 1 *Cor.* 1. 16.) which shows, that the command was general, in order to all who should profess the faith, and not particular, in order to a few, who were to be baptised out of condescendency.

§. 4. *Our* 2. *Reason* against the Apostles baptizing meerly out of condescendency to the Jews, without a command, is, that in that case baptism with water should be used among us, out of condescendency to the weak. This Argument proves, *ad hominem*, that water-baptism is not only lawful (which the Q. deny) but also necessary for exiting of scandal. *G. B.* answers, p. 45. that it will not follow, more then it followeth, that we now should circumcise out of condescendency, because in old time *Paul* did so: and adds (p. 47.) that as circumcision, &c. being once buried, now deadly, and not to be raised up out of their grave in condescendency to any, so likewise water-baptism is now deadly, after the apostacy, &c. *For reply*, circumcision is long ago out of use and honour, dead and buried, forbidden, and accursed. *Gal.* 5. 2. *If ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing*: and *vers.* 12. *I wish they were even cut off that trouble you.* But the like cannot be shown of water-baptism, yea, we defy all our adversaries to produce it.

§. 5. Our 3. Reason is this. If the Apostles baptizing with water was a stumbling-block to the Jews, then the Apostles baptized not with water meerly out of condescension to them. But the first is true, and therefore the last. There is no doubt of the *sequel*, and the *minor* is cleared thus. If the Apostles baptized with water in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and of the Trinity, then their baptizing with water was a stumbling-block to the Jews; for not only humane Histories, but also the Scriptures (1 *Cor.* 1. 23. *Joh.* 8. 58, 59. *Joh.* 10. 33. *Act.* 4. 18, &c.) witnesseth the Trinity and the God-head of Christ to be great stumbling-blocks to them. But so it is, that the Apostles baptized with water in the name of the Trinity, and of the Lord Jesus: *ergo*. The *major* may be proven from *Mat.* 28. If it were once proven (*aliunde*) that baptizing with water is understood here; but because this is now in question, we give in these Texts for our proof, *Act.* 2. 38. where water-baptism is to be understood; for it is contradistinguished from the receiving of the Holy Ghost, and *Peters* teaching them, and their hearing the Word and repenting, and consequently from baptism with the Holy Ghost, *Act.* 10. 46 to 48. which is clear, 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. (which the Q. cannot understood of water-baptism, *Act.* 10. 5. which accompanied the descent of the Holy Ghost upon *Paul*, baptizing, though it be really understood of water-baptizing; and however, is contradistinguished from the

the receiving of the Holy Ghoſt, (v. 6.) and from believing, (v. 2.) and from the teaching of them, and conſequently from the baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, *Acts* 8. 16. where baptizing alſo is contradiſtinguiſhed from the receiving of the Holy Ghoſt, and believing, *&c.* So we have evinced by 3. *Reaſons* that the Apoſtles uſed not water-baptiſm meerly out of condeſcendence, *&c.*

§. 7. *Secondly*, The Baptiſm commanded *Mat.* 28. 16. is Baptiſm with Water; for we read but of three Baptiſms, *Sanguinis*, *Flaminis*, & *fluminis*. But it is not the firſt, nor ſecond: *Therefore* it is the third. Nor will they ſay that it is the firſt; for that is to martyr down all Nations. That it is not the ſecond we prove thus. It is neither the miraculous and extraordinary Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, which conſiſted in the miraculous effuſion of extraordinary Gifts, nor is it the ordinary Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, which conſiſts in the effuſion of ſaving Graces; *Therefore*, it is not Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt at all. The *Antecedent* is proved by parts; and 1. it is not the miraculous baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt; becauſe it is ſeaſed, and none pretend, that ſuch extraordinary gifts, are given now by the laying on of their hands or any other way, as were given to the Apoſtles in the day of *Penticoſt*, and given by the Apoſtles to others afterwards, much leſs to baptize with the Holy Ghoſt and with Fire. This is the baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, of which we affirmed on the Stage, that it was ceaſed, and we prove, that it was ſo out of §. 13. of our account, where we dare them to ſay, *that they give the Holy Ghoſt, as the Apoſtles did* &c. This baptiſm we oppoſed to water-baptiſm, not forgeting the ordinary baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, but including it under water-baptiſm, becauſe they are but one Sacramentally; and therein we followed the example of the Scripture, (*Eph.* 4. 5. 1 *Cor.* 10. 17. *Mat.* 26. 26. &c,) which calls the Sacramental ſigne, and the thing ſignified *one*, and alſo ſpeaks of this miraculous baptiſm, as the baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, κατ' ἐξοχην, *Matth.* 3. 11. compared with *Acts* 1. 5. *Acts* 2. 1. &c.

§. 8. But 2. Is it the ordinary baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt? That baptiſm, which is ſpoken of here, is to be adminiſtred by the Apoſtles and them who taught their Doctrine to the end of the World. But baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, *whether ordinary, or extraordinary*, is not to be adminiſtred by them, *&c.* The *firſt propoſition* cannot be denyed, and as for the *ſecond*, the Apoſtles indeed could pray and lay on hands in old times, in order to the miraculous baptiſm, and effuſion of extraordinary gifts; and both the Apoſtles in old, and holy men in any age, teach and inſtruct others; and thereby, *communicate ſpiritual gifts* to them, as remot accidental Cauſes and means, which

will surely come short of the effect of baptizing with the Holy Ghost and pouring out the saving Graces upon the heart, except the Lord concur in a special gracious manner, and are in respect of the Lord baptizing with the Holy Ghost, as a Catechist, instructing adult Heathens, in order to the outward baptism, is in respect of the Minister, whose it is to baptize them outwardly. But neither the Apostles nor Holy Men do baptize with the Holy Ghost, but only God, which we prove thus. If it be God only, who is the proper and immediate efficient Cause of baptism, with the Holy Ghost, and pourer out of the Gifts and Graces of the Spirit, and men be only remot and accidental causes, *&c.* Then it is God only and not man, who baptizes with the Holy Ghost. But the first is true; *therefore* the last. We dare our Adversaries to deny the *Minor*, and the *Sequel* is clear; for he only is the doer of the Action, who is the proper and immediate efficient Cause, and not he, who is only the remot and accidental cause of it. This cannot be retorted upon water-baptism; for though men administer it as Commissionate from God, yet they are proper, and immediate efficient causes of it, and have it within the sphere of their power to apply the Water, God concurring in a common way of Providence.

§. 9. But to make all sure, if it be only Christ, as he is God, and mightier then *John*, who babtized with the Holy Ghost, then baptism with the Holy Ghost is not to be administred by men: but the first is true from *Mat.* 3. 11. where baptism with the Holy Ghost is peculiarly attributed to Christ, *&c.* *Therefore*, the last is true also. Men indeed can baptize into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; but that this Baptism is Water Baptism, we prove from *Acts* 10. 47, 48. where *Peter* said *can any man forbid water, and he commanded them to be baptized into the name of the Lord*, if these words *in the name of the Lord* should be referred to baptizing, and 1 *Cor.* 1. 13, &c. which the Q. themselves expone concerning Water Baptism. This *Reason* doth not militate against *Teaching* (as *R. B.* alledges p. 43. of his *Duply* to *W. M.*) for it is only outward Teaching (which sometimes has, and sometimes has not the works of conversion following upon it,) which is commanded, *Mat.* 28. as the Action of the Apostles; and inward Teaching by the Spirit, whether by objective revelations, or inlightning the Minde and renewing the Will, which is peculiar to Christ, is not injoyned there at all.

§. 10. But giving and not granting, that baptism with the Holy Ghost, could be administred by men, yet it is not commanded here; for the words then, would be full of needless Tautologies, and the Command would be confounded with the Promise. *Go and teach*, or

disciple (and so indeavoure to make holy and righteous, or to baptize with the Holy Ghost) *all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost,* (or making them holy and righteous, or baptizing them with the Holy Ghost,) *teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you* (or indeavouring to make them holy and righteous, or to baptize them with the Holy Ghost, (*and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world,* that is, by the assistance and powerful operation of my Spirit, accompanying your labours, and making people holy and righteous, or baptizing them with the Holy Ghost, so that ye shall labour effectually. This we have proved by diverse Argumentations, that the baptism commanded *Mat.* 28. is water-baptism; and consequently that water-baptism is to continue in the Church, as long as Christs presence continues with his Apostles; and them who Teach their Doctrine. Now we shall prove by an other *Medium*, our principal *Major*, to wit, that water-baptism is to continue in the Church that long, or to the end of the World.

§. 11. If God sent *John* to baptize with Water, Preach repentance, and thereby to prepare the way to Christ, and the Gospel-church, called by him the Kingdom of Heaven; and Christ himself caused *John* to baptize him with Water-baptism, because it was righteous, so giving his Testimony and Approbation to it; and also commanded, and caused his Apostles to baptize with Water; and did all these by Authority given him from Heaven, and if these Commands and Approbations be never repealed formally, nor have expired of their own nature; then Water-baptism is a standing ordinance, and to continue in the Church. But these first things are true, and therefore the last also. There are four parts in the *Minor*. The *First* is that God sent *John* to baptize with Water, and it is evident from *Joh.* 1. 33. compared with *v.* 23. and 31. and with *Mat.* 3. 3. The *second* part, is that Christ himself caused *John* &c. And it is evident from *Mat.* 3, 13, 14. *&c.* The third *part* is, that Christ commanded and caused his Disciples to baptize with water, and we prove it thus. *Joh.* 3. 22. It is said that *Jesus baptized*, and *Joh.* 4. 2. It is said, that *Jesus himself baptized not, but his Disciples*; *Therefore* he commanded and caused his Disciples to baptize here, and so baptized by them, though he baptized not by himself: and again *Johns* Disciples would not have complained upon Christ, if he had baptized only with the Holy Ghost (which *John* had told them was peculiar to Christ) and not with Water (which Baptism *John* administred) as nevertheless they do *v.* 26, Neither could it be said, that Christ himself baptized not, but his

Disciples, as nevertheless it is, c. 4. *v.* 2. *Therefore* this Baptism was Water-baptism. The fourth part is, that Christ did so by Authority from Heaven, and it is clear from *Joh.* 3. 27. &c. The *sequel* of the *major* is manifest many wayes, and from *Mat.* 28. 20. in particular, where the Apostles are commanded *to teach all nations to observe all things whatsomever he had commanded them*; and promises to be *with them alway, even unto the end of the world.*

§. 12. Our adversaries answer, 1. to the major, and retort it upon *the washing of the Disciples feet with water, anointing the sick with oyl and abstaining from blood & things strangled*, which were once commanded, never repealed, and yet do not bind now. *Answer*, 1. That this retortion hath a damnable tendency, for *Enthusiasts* may arise and plead this same way against the most necessary truths of Law or Gospel. *Ans.* 2. If these things had been commanded, and never repealed, it were better to admit and observe them as yet in the Church, then to reject Baptism and the Lords Supper, and we should indeed in that case be guilty of sin in ommitting them, but they should be doubly guilty, who omit not only these things, but also the Sacraments, *&c.* and so the danger is common, and they are concerned to see to it, as well as we. But, 3 we *Ans.* directly to their retortion, as the particulars lay in order in our *account*. The only place that can be cited for the *washing of one another's feet*, is, *John* 13. and there we are to distinguish between the washing used by Christ himself (which is spoken of from the 4 vers. to the 12.) and the washing commanded by him, which is spoken of from the 12. vers. to the 18. It cannot be denyed that Christ washed his Disciples feet outwardly with water, seing it is said that *he laid aside his garments, took a towel*, &c. Now in this washing used by him he did two things, The first was to hold forth, conveigh and seal up to his Disciples their part in him; because he said to *Peter If I wash thee not, thou hast no part in me*; *i. e.* if thou contemptuously, and obstinatly refuse this washing, wherewith, I will wash all my family at this time, and by thy doing so, bring to pass that I wash thee not, thou has, *&c.* 2. He intended to leave them, and all Christians after them, an example of humility: and its only this second thing, which he commanded to his Disciples, towit, that they should perform acts of humility towards one another, such as the washing of feet was in these Eastern Countries, where the people ordinarily go bare-foot, so that he puts here one act of humility by the figure Synecdochy, for any Act of Humility whatsomever; the like whereof we find in many places of Scripture, as *Phil.* 2. 10. It is said, that *at the Name of Jesus every knee shall bow, Whether it be of things in heaven or in earth, or under the earth*; where bowing the

knee

knee is put ſynecdochically for any act of ſubmiſſion; for the extent of Chriſts dominions is ſignified there, and many things there are, both in Heaven and in and under earth, cannot perform that particular act of bowing the knees, becauſe they have none. That waſhing the feet is put here for any act of humility, and not for this particular act of waſhing the feet *excluſively*: 1. We have ground in the Text, for it is ſaid in it, v. 14. *If I then your Lord and Maſter have waſhed your feet*, &c. and verſ. 16. *The ſervant is not greater then his Lord*, &c. which is a reaſon of the command, and brings in only that we ſhould perform acts of humility towards one another, and not that we ſhould perform this act of waſhing the feet, more then any other act. 2. We grant indeed that *St. Ambroſe* in old and the Church of *Millan* with him did, for a time, obſerve the waſhing of feet for a Sacrament; but otherwiſe, this practice of waſhing one anothers feet, has continued in no Church, as an ordinary and ſtanding ordinance, nor is it owned as a duty by the Chriſtian world, more then the performing of any other act of humility, as ſuitable to the times, places, perſons, *&c.* whereas if he had commanded ſo, ſome would have obſerved it, eſpecially the Apoſtles and primitive Churches, who may be ſuppoſed to have known Chriſts meaning ſufficiently. Yea, God promiſeth to be with them *to the end of the World, in teaching all things whatſoever he had commanded*, Mat. 28. 20.

§. 13. But can the like be ſaid of Baptiſm or the Lords Supper? Or can they prove that waſhing of feet is not here underſtood Synecdochically, which now lyes upon them, as being retorters? we know nothing more that they can ſay, except only, that Chriſt commanded *the* thing, which he did, and he did that particular act of waſhing the feet; *therefore* he alſo commanded it: The *minor* cannot be denyed, and the *major* is proved from the 15. *verſ. Ye ſhould do as I have done to you.* And that the waſhing commanded by Chriſt holds forth, conveighs and ſeals to us our part in Chriſt; becauſe, *if we know theſe things, happy are we, if we do them*, ver. 17. And therefore there is no difference betwixt the waſhing uſed, and the waſhing commanded by Chriſt. *Anſw.* 1. We will give them alike for alike: what Chriſt had performed he commanded. But he had performed the outward act of waſhing the feet, and not the inward only, of which ſome Q. have expounded this command to us; therefore, he alſo commanded the outward act, *&c.* And again, the waſhing commanded by Chriſt makes us happy, *ver.* 17. and the outward waſhing uſed by Chriſt, gives us part in him, and therefore there is no difference betwixt them. 2. We *anſw.* directly by *diſtinguiſhing the major* of the firſt Argumentation; what Chriſt performed he commanded. *He commanded*

manded all that be performed, that we deny: for he held forth, conveighed, and sealed up to them a part in himself, and said, that if *he washed them not, they had no part in him*. But he did not command them to do so; neither said he, *if ye wash not* another, ye have no part in me. He *commanded something that be performed*, it's true; but he commanded that particular act of washing one anothers feet precisely, and excluding all other acts of humility like it, we deny. He commanded that act of humility, and other acts of humility like it, it's true, and we practise them, as occasion offers, which only we ought to do; neither doth the Scripture cited prove more, *viz. I have left you an example, that you should do as I have done*, the like of what I have done, not the thing that *I* have done only and precisely. So we deny the *antecedent* of the second Argumentation, and to the proof of it, we say, that happy are they who does these things, not all of them, but the acts of humility, and that not the particular acts of washing of the feet precisely and exclusively, but it or the like of it, when occasion offers, such acts of humility, as it was in these hot Eastern Countreys.

§. 14. As to the anointing of the sick with oyl, the only or chief place that can be cited for it, is, *James* 5. 14. And we *answ.* briefly, that, if this be a command to anoint the sick with oyl, it carries along a repeal in its bosome, it being given only in order to miraculous cures, and whilst the gift of miracles continued in the Church; which being now ceased, the command also ceases of its own nature; for, *cessante fine legis, cessat & obligatio.* But do Q. cure the sick so now? and if not, how do they justifie themselves from the violation of these commands? Or can they shew that all the ends of baptism and the Lords Supper assigned by our Divines, are ceased now? And as to the abstaining from blood, and things strangled, the command for it is found, *Act.* 15. But it will prove a sandy foundation like the rest; for an expres repeal of it is to be found in 1 *Cor.* 10. 25. *Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no question for conscience sake*: which was written long after the Council of *Jerusalem*, set down, *Acts* 15.

§. 15. So we have vindicated our Argument from their retortions. It follows, that we examine a repeal given in by them: and it is (*Joh.* 3. 30.) that *Christ must increase, but John must decrease*, and therefore the command given to *John* to baptize with water, is repealed. To this we *answer*, that when Christs Gospel was most flourishing, *Johns* baptism, or water-baptism was most practised, Christ himself was baptized with water-baptism, and called it righteousness; and in this same 3 *Chap.* commanded and caused his Disciples to bap-

tize

tize with water, as we proved already. *Therefore* this is not a repeal of the command given to *John* to baptize with water: and we expound it of *Johns* honour, glory, multitude of Disciples, power, mighty works, *&c.* which decreased, whereas Christs daily increased.

§. 16. *Our last medium* is, that water-baptism was commanded to them who had received the Holy Ghost, and believed already, yea, even for this reason, that they had received the Holy Ghost, *Acts* 10. 47, 48. *Can any man forbid water*, &c. That *Peter* there commanded them to be baptized, out of necessity arising from a divine precept, and caused not to baptize them meerly out of condescension to their weakness, may be proved, 1. from the words (*in the Name of the Lord*) if they be referred to the commanding; for to do or command a thing in ones name, is a common phrase, and signifies the doing or the commanding of the thing, by his command, warrand, and authority; and though these words may be taken otherwise sometimes in the Scripture, yet here they must be taken thus, or else they cannot be sensed handsomely. 2. We prove it from the 6. *vers.* where the Angel shews *Cornelius*, that *Peter should tell him what he ought to do*: But *Peter* told him of baptism with water; therefore he ought to be baptized with water, and consequently had a command obliging him to it. But 3. and *lastly*, we make it out from the following *Chap. Act.* 11. where *Peter* being accused for this his preaching and administring baptism with water unto these Gentiles, he vindicates himself fully, and shews sufficient warrand from God, for all that he had done: In particular, *vers.* 17. he averrs that to deny this baptism to them upon whom the Holy Ghost had fallen, as upon the Apostles themselves at the beginning, had been no less then to withstand God: which the brethren having heard, they also held their peace and glorified God.

Section V.

Concerning the Ministry.

§. 1. These Enthusiastical impostures in their 7th. Thesis teach, that a man, without true sanctifying and saving grace, cannot be a Minister of Christ, nor profit souls. We, on the other hand, judge, that a man ought not to be admitted to the Ministry, till tryal be first made both into his knowledge and conversation; and he be found Orthodox, and such as *ex judicio charitatis*, is to be esteemed

ed truly pious; and that, if he be really such, it will be the better for himself, because he will have comfort of his Ministry, especially in the day of his accompts, which a graceless Minister cannot have; and likewise he will be more desireable and acceptable to sincere Christians, then if he were heterodox or vicious: But, though he were an hypocrite, yet a true and lawful Pastor he may be, and also be an instrument of souls edification, and ought to be owned as such by the people, till he be orderly and by authority divested of his office.

§. 2. Our 1. *Reason* then, against these vain pretenders, shall be taken from many Jewish Priests and high Priests, and many Scribes and Pharisees in Christs time: for they were Ministers of Gods Word, and albeit they were not under the New-Testament dispensation, yet had the like Souls to edifie, the same God to sanctifie, and a work every way requiring true godliness, as well as the Gospel-ministry doth now. But who will say, that they were indued with Sanctifying Grace? A 2. *Reason* is taken from *Judas* the Traitor: *For he obtained a part of the same Ministry with the* rest of the Apostles, and had his Bishoprick (*Acts* 1.) and yet was *the son of Perdition* (Joh. 17, 12.) that is, destinated unto destruction, as interpreters expound this Phrase, and other Hebraisms like it, he was chosen and not chosen in diverse respects, *chosen* to the Apostleship, and yet not *chosen to eternal life*, but was a *devil*, even in the time of his greatest profession, while he was an Apostle *following Christ*, and had a place of his own prepared for him, *to which he went*, Joh. 6. 70. compared with *Joh.* 13. 18. and *Acts* 1. 25.

§. 3. The 3. *Proof* is, that the efficacy of the Word, depends not upon the worthiness of the Preachers; because, *neither is he that planteth, any thing, nor he that watereth: but God that giveth the increase*, 1 Cor. 3. 7. But our 4. *Argument* shall be formed thus; If we cannot know who have true Grace, then to teach, that the same is simply necessar, to the being of a Minister, tends to disorder and confusion in the Church; yea, and to a total rejection of the Ordinance of Gospel-ministry, and consequently is not to be admitted. But the First is true, *ergo*. The Sequel is easiely proved, because in that case, we cannot know whom we shall own for our Minister; yea, and ought to own none, seing we cannot know that they have true Saving Grace: neither is there any difficulty in the assumption; for 1. We cannot immediatly know, that they have any such thing, it being the priviledge of God alone, to know the Heart immediatly, nor 2. Can we know by their outward works, unless it be *ex judicio charitativo*, which may deceive us; for all the works which a godly man can do, may likewise be performed, as to the outward, by Hipocrites

Nor

Nor 3. can we know it be revelation; for, as we have already evicted, sufficiently, we have no such thing our selves, neither do any pretend to it, except Enthusiasts, who are deluded themselves, and endeavour to delude others also: and moreover, though some in the Primitive times had the gift of discerning spirits, yet it was never common to all; for it is expressly said, 1 *Cor.* 12. 10. *to another is given the working of miracles, to another the discerning of Spirits*, &c.

§. 4. Concerning the Ministry, it is also controverted, betwixt us and these disorderly intruders. If an immediate Enthusiastick call from God by way of inspiration be necessary, there is indeed an inward call which consists in the disposition of the Soul: and concerning it we say, that the Pastors of the Church ought not to admit any to the Ministry, but such as upon tryal are found to have competent Gifts and Qualifications for the Work; and none ought to accept this Office, but such as have both these competent Gifts, and also an unfeigned and unbyassed desire to serve God in the Office: but yet if ignorent or greedy persons be admitted, the people is to own them as their Ministers till they be orderly divested of the Office. The Q. require further, an immediate Enthusiastick Call by Gods immediate objective Voice and Command, which we reject as altogether needless, and impugne 1. because there is no ground in the Scriptures for asserting the necessity of such a call. Neither 2. ought we to believe, that any now have the same, because Enthusiasts, who only pretend to it, give us no sufficient evidence, that they are so called; they neither have, nor can produce any such thing, for before whom do they come with Miracles; and, as for that prediction, *Joel* 2, 28. we read, that it was accomplished, *Acts* 2. 16, 17. But who will apply it to Q. or other Enthusiasts, who have no such wonders in the Heavens above, nor signs in the Earth beneath, accompanying their Ministry, as are mentioned in that Prophecy. We therefore do not seek Miracles simply, and only as *R. B.* callumniates us in both his passionate pamphlets against that most sober Person, *W. M.* But a sufficient evidence we desire, or any extraordinary thing done in the confirmation of their Call, which can only be from God, and so cannot agree to false Teachers.

§. 5. But to tell the truth, this fals Teacher is not more disingenuous in representing us so, then impertinent in pratling that *this was the very objection, which the Papists made against our first reformers*, Luther *and* Calvine: For let it be so, that the Argument is the same, yet the cases are not alike, nor can Q. give any such satisfactory answer thereto, as the first reformers could give, seing that these excellent

men (although they had an extraordinary Call, in respect of their Heroick gifts, and so were (as *Calvin* indeed termeth some in his time *Institut. lib. 4. c. 3.*) *Apostles, or at least Evangelists* in some sense; yet they, also had a mediate Call as well as other Pastors, they owned the Holy Scriptures for their principal Rule, and Preached no other Gospel then that which was already confirmed with miracles, and several other wayes by Christ and his Apostles; and consequently, there was no need of Miracles or predictions, *&c.* to evidence their call. But on the other part, these Q. are altogether destitute of a mediate call, they suspend the Authority of the Scriptures upon Enthusiastical revelations, as they will confess, and Preach another Gospel, as we conceive to be sufficiently proved in this and other treatises; and consequently, they must produce their Credentials, before we receive them.

§. 6. Yea, Reason hath prevailed so far even with this Enthusiastical Tribe, that they judge themselves concerned to shew their Evidences, and therefore, they assigne us the Efficacy of their Doctrine, (in their *Truth cleared of Calumnies*, p. 57.) To which we reply, 1. That there are strong Delusions, and Popery, Mahumetanism, *&c.* have prevailed as much over the World, as ever Quakerism did. And 2. if their Doctrine wrought so efficaciously upon hearts, as to deserve belief and credite, would it not be by solid Arguments and Motives? Would not they give Evidences and Demonstrations from Scripture, and Reason, *&c.* which would be sufficient to convince gain-sayers in a rational way, as *Paul* did to the *Thessalonians* and *Corinthians*, *Stephen* and *Apollos* to the Jews, (*Act.* 17. 2, 3. compared with 1 *Thes.* 1. 5. and *Act.* 18. 4. compared with 1. *Cor.* 2. 4. *Act.* 18. 28. and *Act.* 6. 9.) so making the Efficacy of their Doctrine, joyned with Miracles, Predictions, Intrinsick Characters of Gods Word, *&c.* to be a seal of their Apostleship, but not as separated from the same, and taken precisely by it self: Whereas they give us no such evidences and demonstrations of the Spirit; but only boast of their own attainments and revelations, repeating to us *ad nauseam*, *I say to you, dear people; plainly I tell thee friend* &c. and striving to prevail over our Affections, because they cannot clear our Judgements. We therefore, leave these new Prophets, to search out their Charters and Evidences, and proceed to the mediate and outward Call by the Church, which they deny, and we affirm to be necessary, being moved thereto, by these and the like *Reasons*.

§ *Argument* 1. That whereof we have instances commanded by the Holy Ghost; and likewise we have the practice and unrepealed, unrestricted command of the Holy Ghost, is necessary. But such is the

me-

mediate and outward Call to the Miniſtry : *ergo*, the *minor*, which only needs probation, is confirmed from *Act.* 13. 2. and 3. where we have an inſtance of this Call commanded by the Holy Ghoſt, ſaying, *Seperate unto me* Saul *and* Barnabas, &c. And from *Act.* 14. 23. where we have the practice of the ſame *Paul* and *Barnabas* warranted be the Holy Ghoſt, this ordaining of Elders being a part of *the Work, whereunto the Holy Ghoſt had ordained them*: And from *Tit.* 1. 5. where the Apoſtle expreſly declares, that *he had appointed* Titus *to ordain Elders in every Church.* To theſe places add, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. where mention is made of *Timothies outward call and gifts beſtowed upon him, in and by the ſame* : And 1 *Tim.* 3. Chap. 14, and 15. ver. where the Apoſtle, having in the foregoing part of the Chapter, ſet down the qualifications of a Biſhop, and Duties of ſeveral other Perſons, he ſubjoyns, *that he wrot theſe things, for the end, that* Timothy *might know, how he ought to behave himſelf in the Church of God*, as *to the* appointing and overſeing of theſe perſons : And Chap. 5. 21, and 22. The ſame *Paul*, preſcribes him ſome Cautions concerning this ordaining of Presbyters, *viz. that he ſhould not prefer one before another, nor do any thing by partiality; Nor lay hands ſuddenly upon any man*, &c. Now what reaſon can be given for reſtricting theſe Commands, to the primitive times only? Or what leſs need have we of a mediate Call, then theſe Churches had? But hath not the Apoſtle himſelf, preoccupied this Cavil 2 *Tim.* 2. 2? where he expreſly ſaith, *the things which thou haſt heard of me, among many witneſſes, the ſame commit unto faithful men, who ſhall be able to teach others alſo.* R. B. Moreover in his *Calumnies*, Cavilleth, that the Texts, *Tit.* 1. 5. *Act.* 14. 23. do not prove, that theſe Elders had not the Call of the Spirit of God in themſelves. But what is this to the purpoſe? We hope theſe Texts, and the other places cited by us, do ſufficiently prove, the neceſſity of the outward and mediate Call : and we never intended from them, to impugne the immediate Enthuſiaſtick Call, which is ſufficiently battered down by many other Arguments and places of Scripture beſides this; far leſs can we ſee how Quakers can prove from the ſame, that theſe Elders needed not an outward and mediate Call by the Church.

§. 8. *Arg.* 2. That, which is a part of the foundation of Chriſtianity, and of the firſt principles of the oracles of God, as well as the doctrines of faith, and repentance, and the reſurrection from the dead, and eternal judgement, is neceſſary in the Church. But ſuch is the mediate and outward call to the Miniſtry: *ergo*. The *Major* is

evident, the *Minor* we prove from *Heb.* 6. 1 and 2. *Therefore leaving the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection, not laying again the fundation of repentance from dead works —— and of laying on of hands, &c.* Where we are to mark, 1. That the leaving of the first principles cannot be forsaking of them; for we ought never to forsake the doctrines of faith and repentance, &c. but it is the not resting upon the knowledge of them, without going foreward to other things. And, 2. though these doctrines be all reckoned out together as fundamental parts of Christianity and so they be all necessary, the one of them as well as the rest; yet hence we may not conclude, that they are all equally necessary, the one as much as the other: which is cleared by a like Text, Act. 15. 28, and 29. where the abstaining from blood, and from fornication, are [illegible] that time accompted necessary and yet who will deny, but the one was more necessary then the other? But, 3. The Apostle here is to be supposed to speak only of setled and constituted Churches, and of following times; for God did immediatly call the Apostles themselves to the ministry. And 4. We add that though some private persons may be without the explicit knowledge of this outward call of Ministers, as made by the laying on of hands, yet it is necessary in the Church for eviting of disorder and confusion, and is some way known of all in the same who own such and such persons for their Ministers, as being called and set over by other Pastors. From this Scripture then we argue thus; That which is here signified by the laying on of hands; is a part of the fundation, &c. But can this be any other thing, then the mediate and outward call of the Ministry (for laying on of hands in absolution, &c. has ceased altogether, which the foundation, or any part of it cannot do: and likewise laying on of hands in confirmation is ceased among many, whom we dare not un church and affirm to have erred in fundamentals: neither is it so necessary in the Church as is this laying on of hands in calling persons to the Ministry, as all will confesse, who weigh things aright; yea both these impositions of hands is denyed by our adversaries, and so it is the outward call to the Ministry which is meant here) and therefore, is a part of the fundation, &c.

§. 9. But all the controversies concerning the Ministry are not as yet canvassed: these unruly *lay-Prophets* have as great a pick at the Ministry, as ever wolves had at shep-herds; and therefore agitate as many quarrels against them as malice can devise. We shall yet briefly consider that *concerning the maintainance of Ministers*, and so much the rather, because our adversaries uncessantly cry out against the same, knowing, that many will be apt to drink in one opinion tending to their private gain, and advantage however unlawful, and intending

with

with all thereby to ſtarve the Paſtors from their flocks, that they may the more eaſily have them for a prey. Our Churches in the mean time do no wiſe approve of ſuch men, as out of a covetous deſire ſet about the work of the Miniſtry, only, mainly for their own private gain and outward reward, and when the ſame is withdrawn or overballanced with diſadvantage, are ready to flye and leave the ſheep: Theſe are hirelings indeed and covetous of filthy lucre. Nor ſecondly, think we as Q: belie us, that the preaching of the Goſpel can be ſold for any earthly wages or hyre (as an ox or an horſe may be ſold) yea, there is a vaſt diſproportion and inequality in worth betwixt the ſame, and whoſoever will think to doe ſo, we judge him guilty of ſimony in the higheſt degree: and hence we may know, in what ſenſe our Saviour, *Mat.* 10. chap. 8. ver. commandeth his Diſciples *to heal the ſeek cleanſe the Lepers: and as they had freely received, ſo freely to give, viz.* that they were not to make ſail, fare leſs to expect a price proportionable in worth to theſe benefits, but not at all, That they ſhould refuſe their maintainance, for in the 8. and 10. v. they are *forbidden to prouide gold or ſilver, two coats or ſhoes, becauſe the workman is worthy of his meat.* But, 3. which is

§. 10. *The ſtate of the controverſie*, we hold that the preachers of the Goſpel ought to have ſuch ſtipends allowed them, yea, and may contract and agree for the ſame with Chriſtian people, fare more may the civil Magiſtrate enact Laws and ſtatutes for paying ſuch ſtipends to them, as may be ſufficient for the honeſt and credible maintainance of themſelves and their families, and they may be enabled to be charitable and hoſpital. This is all that we affirm; and though this Sacrilegous crew of Q: oppoſe it, yet it is eaſily and evidently proven: For the holy and bleſſed Apoſtle Paul in his firſt to the Corinthians and 9. cap. where he handles this queſtion *ex inſtituto*, vehemently expoſtulateth with his adverſaries, *If he had not power to eat and to drink, to lead about a Chriſtian wife as well as other Apoſtles*, and yet, *to forbear working*. and 1 Tim. 3. and 2. he requireth it as a neceſſary *condition in a Biſhop, that he be given to hoſpitality.* Ought not they then to have ſuch ſtipends as are competent for theſe ends. But 2. *They who go a warfare, deſerve their wages, and he who plants a Vineyard deſerves to eat of the fruit thereof*, &c. *and the labourer is worthy of his reward*; and therefore, the Miniſters of the Goſpel deſerves their ſtipends. So likewiſe argueth S. Paul himſelf, 1 *Cor.* 9. 7. &c. and 1 *Tim.* 5. 17 and 18. But 3. *ſaith not the Law the ſame alſo; For it is written in the Law of Moſes*, &c. *and do you not know that they who miniſter about holy things, live of the things of the Temple, which was of divine right, and even ſo, the* ſame way, *hath the Lord ordained, that they which*

preach

preach the Gospel, should live by the Gospel, saith the same Apostle *ibidem*; and how is it then, that our Ministers are called hirelings now for receiving stipends, more then the Priests were called hirelings in old for receiving tithes? So we have sufficiently confirmed the first part of our assertion, and out of the same, the other doth naturally flow; for if ministers have such right to their stipends, why may they not contract and agree with their particular flocks, and the civil Magistrate enact Laws concerning them, which is but to lay new obligations upon them for the performing of that which was their duty however. But we go on to enquire in

Section VI.

If the Civil Magistrate hath power of coercing and punishing with his temporal sword, the errours and heresies, Blasphemie and Idolatries broached and born in upon people in his own dominions?

§. 1. The Papists here and especially the Jesuites teach, that all Hereticks (that is to say all without exception who discent from the Church of Rome) are to be put to death. And on the other hand the *Socinians* maintain, that no Hereticks, however pernicious, are to be restrained by the secular power. So likewise the Q: for to omit other proofs for the time, they in a disput between them and us holden in their meeting-house, *Junii* 1. 1675. (an account whereof we have by us) did give in that Scripture in Mat. 5. *Resist not evil* as a repeal of the Laws made under the old Testament for the punishing of Idolaters and Blasphemers; and expresly denyed heresie and blasphemy, &c. to be included in that place to the *Rom.* cap. 13. v. 4. he is the Minister of God to execute wrath upon him that doth eval. But we dissent from them both, abhoaring as much the inhumane cruelty of the Papists upon the one part, as the vast toleration of the Libertines upon the other, and judge that hereticks, Idolaters Blasphemers, Seducers, and other the like enemies of the Gospel are to be coerced and restrained of the several Magistrats by the temporal sword in their respective dominions, according to the measure of the fault, the dispositions of the persons, and the variety of the other circumstances.

§. 2. For

§. 2. For the better understanding of this our sentence, let it be marked 1. that we speak only of real heresies, &c, be what they will; and no, what others call heresies; and 2. we speak only of heresies &c vented outwardly and proposed to the people; and not concerning the inward acts *and meer exercise of conscience* (with which names the Q: in their theses have varnished their errour) for we acknowledge, that heretical doctrines conceived only in the mind, and no wise breaking forth outwardly do not fall under the censure either of Magistrate or Church, seing it belongs to neither of them to judge of hidden things: And so we detaste likewise the savage cruelty of the Romish inquisitors, who extort confessions from men by tortures. But 3. we speak only of them who are subjects, and do not allow Magistrates any power of invading forraigne Kingdoms meerly to take revenge of such sins or propagate the Gospel. 5. we say according to the measure of the several faults; because some of them are so gross and blasphemous, which deserve even natural death; some are of a middle size, which are to be coerced by banishment, imprisonment, fyning, &c. And some there are of the loweſt degree, controverted among men otherwise Orthodox and well disposed, in order to which lenitives are to be used rather then causticks. But. 6. a special difference there is to be made amongst persons erring, for in obstinate Hereticks and in seditious persons many things are to be punished severely, [illegible] in the more honest and sober and in ignorant well meaning persons, are to be born with greater moderation. Lastly, we add, that as in many cases even relating to the second table, so likewise in this present matter very much is left to the prudence of the Christian Magistrate as keeper of both the tables, because the variety of circumstances is so vast, that hardly could general laws determine what is to be done in all particular cases; and therefore the civil Magistrate is not only to inflict the punishments determined already in the Scriptures of God, but also he is very often to determine the punishments themselves according to the general rules of Scripture, dictats of reason, good of the Church and peace of the Commonwealth. So we are come to our

§. 3. *Arg.* 1. what God hath commanded the civil Magistrate to do, & hath never repealed, the civil Magistrate is yet to do the same, as all will confess. But so it is, that God hath commanded him to curb seducers, Idolaters, Blasphemers, with the temporal sword *Deut.* 13. 5. and *Exo.* 22. 20. *Levit.* 24. [illegible] *Ergo*, the civil Magistrate is yet to do the same. For answer to this Argument *G: K:* in the aforesaid disput *junii.* 1 gave in that place *Matth.* 5. and 39. *Resist not evil* as one repeal of these old-testament commands. But if we can prove, that this command *resist not evil* is given to private persons only, and not also to the Magistrates

(as the Q. then most eagerly and openly asserted) then it cannot be a repeal of the former Lawes given to Magistrats, as such; upon this dependeth the whole matter, and therefore to evict it, we argue thus: If Christ had forbidden Magistrats as such to resist evil, then among Christians no man ought to curb or resist any kind of Vice whatsoever; and consequently among them, there should be no Government, which is to teach Treason and Confusion, yea, and the toleration of all wickedness. Here *M. Keith*, after many windings and turnings, many protestations of the Quakers loyalty and accusations of malice and envy, intended by us, as he alledged, in choosing out this Thesis to impugne, he presented us with a pair of Dispensations of the Gospel, distinct from the Old-testament one and both now among Christians, to wit, one somewhat obscure and legal (which they, who are not Quakers, have among them, under which they, yea, and Q may go to Law with them, before their Legal Magistrats, but it is unlawful to kill Theeves or Robbers, *&c.* And as for Murtherers, he was not clear to tell the Q. Judgement of them) and another most clear and Evangelick Dispensation, which Q. have among themselves, and under which, all outward resistance of evil, shall be unlawful. Where having played the Sophist egregiously, and with prolixity he was

§. 41. Required by us, to give a ground of this twofold Dispensation out of the Scriptures, and he out of an intention only to shift us off, propounded this Paralogism. There is a Dispensation, under which, it is not lawful to resist evil, according to that, *Mat.* 5. *Resist not evil.* But it is not your Dispensation (said he) for under it, evil is to be resisted, according to your selves; therefore, it is another, and so there are two. To which, as then, so now, we reply, by denying the first proposition, which proceeds concerning all outward resistance, to be made by any person whatsoever, whether Magistrats or private Persons; and so is not well proven from that in *Mat.* which is to be understood only of private Persons, repaying evil at their own pleasure; and not concerning Magistrates also, whereupon our Adversaries again urged, that in exponing Scripture, we ought not to recede from the literal sense of the Words, without an urgent necessity; But this Scripture saith to all without restriction, *resist not evil*, and there is no urgent necessity of exponing it concerning private Persons only, and not only of Magistrates as such, *Ergo*, it is to be exponed of them both, that they should not resist evil. So they Dispute as if we were hammering out a mystical sense (which is their ordinary custom) and willingly forget, that we have proven the necessity of our Exposition already; because if Christ had forbid-

den

den Magistrates as such to resist evil, there should be no curbing of any Wickedness whatsoever, nor Government among Christians, *&c.* but

§. 5. *Ex Superabundanti*, if Magistrates be ordained of God to bear the *Sword*, and with it to execute the wrath upon evil doers, *&c.* Then Magistrates are to resist and repay evil, and that place in *Mat.* is to be expounded of private Persons only, *&c.* But the first is evident from *Rom.* 13. 1, 2. *&c.* and therefore the last also. If *S. Matthew* say, that Magistrats should not resist evil, surely *S. Paul* contradicts him; for he saith, that the Magistrats ought to execute *Wrath upon evil doers.* The Q. there manifest themselves so great favourites of Magistracy, as to bid us prove, that it is the temporal Sword, which is meaned in this place of Scripture, and not the Spiritual, *quasi vero*, even as if the Civil Magistrate had the power of Excomunication, and as if the Spiritual Sword of Church Discipline, did terrifie all evil doers. Yea, they added also, that this place is to be understood concerning *Nero*, because it saith, *the powers that be*, &c. and desired us, to prove that the present Magistrates are included there likewese, notable friends indeed to the present Magistrates, and very worthy of thanks at their hands. But is not the Scripture written for our cause, and these Epistles to be received, and obeyed by us, as well as by these Primitive Christians, where there is no special reason of restricting the same to them? And now what ground is there, of limiting that place in the first of *Pet.* 2. Chap. 13. 14. 15. Vers. *submit your selves to every ordinance of Man*, &c. which is the parallel of this place to the *Romans*? Or even what reason have we, for restricting this to the *Romans*, are not the Higher Powers now a-dayes the ordinance of God; and are not our present Magistrats the Ministers of God, to punish evil doers, and encourage them that do well, *&c.* and as to that words, *the powers that be, are ordained of God* doth not the very reading of them manifest, that the sense is, as if the Apostle had said, *let every soul*, in all ages, *be subject to the higher powers*; *for there is no power* in whatsoever time, *but of God.* Yea, the very *powers that be*, at the present time, to wit, cruel *Nero* and his inferiour Rulers *are ordained of God*; and therefore other Powers also, especially Christian Magistrates, *à fortiori*, *whosoever therefore resisteth any power, resisteth the ordinance of God*, &c. So our *Antagonists*, have discovered something of their respect to our Magistrates; but have given us no solid ground, of their two-fold Dispensation out of the Scriptures.

§. 6. But 2ly. Suppose there were such a twofold Dispensation, yet our Argument holds; for it doth not proceed concerning the Quakerish Evangelick Dispensation, which according to themselves, has not as yet, taken root in the Earth, but only concerning our own present legal Dispensation. Either then our Magistrats of the present legal Dispensation (as Q. are pleased to nickname them) have no power to punish with a Temporal Sword, nor resist evil; which to say, is *Treason*: or they have power to resist evil, and so its not they, but private Persons who are forbidden, *Mat.* 5. to resist evil; and consequently, that is not a repeal of the Old Testament Laws, but our Magistrates are yet to coerce and punish *Hereticks*, *Blasphemers*, *&c.*

§. 7. We proceed to the other repeal, mentioned in the foresaid Dispute by *G. K.* though not insisted on, which is, *Mat.* 13. 29, 30. *pluck not up the tares*, &c. and it is clearly repealed. For 1. are not Murtherers witches, traitors and all other malefactors understood by the *tares* as well as Hereticks, *&c.* Seing Christ explains the Tares to be the *children of the devil*, v. 38. *workers of iniquity*, v. 41. Among which these wicked livers are to be reckoned no less then false Teachers? And therefore if the one be exumed from the coercive Powers of Magistrates, are not the other so likewise; which is indeed, to abolish Magistracy altogether, and to lay open a large flood-gate to all kind of Malefactors. But 2. the Tares are then only to be spared, when there is a hazard of rooting out the Wheat with them, as is evident from *vers.* 29. But many Hereticks and Blasphemers, *&c.* there be, as well as vicious livers, who cannot be tolerated, without great danger to the Wheat (that is) to good Persons; and therefore, notwithstanding all that is here said, they are not to be spared more then these, and by this time it is clear, that in this Parable, there is no repeal of the Old Testament Commands, to punish false Teachers and Blasphemers, *&c.* But 3. as to the real scope of this Parable, some there are, who by the *Field*, understand the World, and by the *Tares*, all the wicked men and women in the World without exception: and according to them, Christ meaneth, that the wicked by Gods Providence, were to live together with the godly in the World, unto the end of the same, but are then to be gathered out among them, and cast into a Furnace of Fire: so that the words, *let them grow together*, are no wise preceptive but indicative of Gods permission: but Christ never intended either to exeem false Teachers, or scelerous Persons from the Rod of the Magistrate. Others by the *Field*, understand the Church of God, which also in Scripture, is often called *the World*, and by *Tares*, the bemasked Hipocrites, that can scarcely be discerned from

from the truly faithful, which they confirme, becauſe *Hierome*, who traveled through all Judea, writting upon this 13. of *Mat.* deſcribeth the *Tares*, or *Zizania* to be ſo like the Wheat, that before the blade be ſprung up, they cannot without great difficulty, if at all be diſcerned from Wheat, which our Lord himſelf ſeemeth likewiſe to imply, in the 26. ver. where he ſaith, that *Then*, at laſt when the blade was ſprung up, appeared the Tares alſo, and in the 29. v. where he ſaith, that in plucking up the Tares, there would be hazard of rooting up the Wheat with them; and therefore, the Tares here ſignifie, not openly flagitious Perſons, and pernicious Hereticks, who being rather like to Briers and Thiſtles then to Tares, are eaſily diſcerned, and can be plucked up without any damnage to the godly; but they denote, diſembled Hipocrites, who yet ſometimes diſcover Hipocricy by their outward ſins, but, becauſe the truely Godly, are likewiſe lyable to the ſame outward failings, they are to be ſpared and ſuffered to live with them. And, according to this expoſition, it only follows, that they are not to be driven out of the Church, who are ſtained with leſſer blots, leſt by too great ſeverity, the chief members of the Church ſhould be cut off from the ſame. So we have gotten no repeal of the Old-teſtament Commands to puniſh falſe Teachers and Blaſphemers, *&c.*. And therefore, our Magiſtrates are yet to execute Wrath upon them.

§. 8. *Argument* 2. Delinquencies, which are publick and very hurtful to the Common-wealth, are ſurely to be puniſhed by the Magiſtrate according to the attrocity of the Crime; for, if ſuch evil doers eſcaped unpuniſhed, the Common-wealth ſhould be quite undone, and Magiſtracy altogether loſs its end, which is to take vengeance upon evil doers, 1 *Pet.* 2. 14. *Rom.* 13. 4. Hereſies, *&c.* then vented in a Common-wealth, are they not to be puniſhed by the Magiſtrate, according to the degrees of them, and as they are more or leſs peſtilent, ſeing that thereby the faith of the members of Common-wealth is overthrown, and not only ſo, but likewiſe the publick Peace interrupted: for, when there is a publick diſſent of mind, and an open diſagreeance of Faith and Religion, how can Faith and Concord be expected there, even as to civil Affaires? who were more ſtrictly joyned together at ſome time, then the Children of *Judah* and *Iſrael*: But after that, Altar was erected againſt Altar, and Temple againſt Temple, they were preſently diſ-united and rent aſſunder inconceiveably. We might likewiſe here ſpeak ſomething of *Arians*, *Macedonians*, *Papiſts*, *Anabaptiſts*, and alſo of *Quakers*, who look as meekly and reſpectfully, upon the Orthodox Party, as Vipers and Serpents do upon men: but, to leave this task to the reader, are not

all the reasons to be found in Hereticks, for which vindictive Justice is used, in any case to be exerced upon evil doers. For 1. they are ravening Wolves, *Mat.* 7. 15. and do great injury, both to Church and Common-wealth, which is to be repaired by punishment, if any other injuries ought to be so. 2. Their Doctrine doth eat like Canker, as *Paul* tells us, 2 *Tim.* 2. and 17. *Arius* was but a spark (saith *Hierom* upon *Gal.* 5.) but, because it was not presently extinguished, the flame of it overran the whole World; and therefore Hereticks are to be suppressed, that others may be deterred, and learn to shun the like contagion. 3. Trouble giveth understanding, and as *Augustine* in his retractations, Book 2. Cap. 5, observes the punishment of Hereticks served to change them to the better, no less then other Malefactors.

§. 9. But our Adversaries here distinguish betwixt simple Hereticks and perturbers of the Common-wealth, as if the Magistrate ought to exert his power against them only, and not against these likewise. To which we reply, 1. that all the advancers of Heresie are perturbers of the State, if not by perturbing of, and exclaiming against the exercise of lawful politick affairs, yet they do so by troubling the members of the Common-wealth in the exercise of their lawful Callings, Ecclesiastical or Civil. Yea, they abuse the State more then any other Malefactors, for they steal away the most precious things, as Faith and Religion, the Souls and Salvation of men, whereas others take only the goods of fortune. We might likewise shew here, that the neglect of Churches hath oft times brought on the desolation of Common-wealths; but all know this, who are but indifferently versed in Histories either Sacred or Civil.

§. 10. But Secondly we say, that the Magistrate ought by his Authority, to suppresse publick sins, against the first Table of the Law, as *Heresie*, *Blasphemy*, *Idolatry*, &c. even although politick State were no wayes indamnaged by them: and our Reasons are these. 1. Because the Magistrate is the keeper and maintainer of both the Tables of the Law. And 2. its not only the charge of mens Bodies, and Fortunes, that is intrusted to the Civil Magistrate, but also that of the Church and of Souls; for as the Apostle Teacheth, 1 *Tim.* 2. 2. the Magistrates ought to have a care that their Subjects live, not only a quiet; but likewise a godly life; and as we find in the Books of the Kings and Chronicles, several Kings of Judah were highly commended of God for discharging their duty this way. And 3. the Magistrate is the Minister of God to execute Wrath upon him that doth, or acteth evil. But they who broach Heresies, do evil; and therefore the Magistrate ought to execute Wrath upon them. where our Adversaries

verſaries dare not deny the *Minor*, neither can they infringe the *Major*, ſeing the Spirit of God hath expreſly aſſerted that he is the executer *of wrath upon him that doth*, or outwardly acteth evil, without any reſtriction, and it is not lawful for us to add a reſtriction, where the Spirit of God hath putten no reſtriction.

§. 11 *Arg.* 3. Many great and renowned princes, as ſuch have coerced Idolaters, Blaſphemers, Seducers, &c. even with his approbation, who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords; and therefore all princes are to do ſo in their own dominions. It follows clearly; becauſe what agrees to any, as ſuch agrees to all ſuch: the firſt part is evident from multitudes of Scriptures; for which we refer the reader to *Exod.* 32. *Numb.* 25. *Lev.* 24. where we have the example of Moſes King of Jeſuran, who was faithful in all the houſe of God. to 2 *Chron.* 15. 13. where we have the conſtitution and example of aſah: To 2 *Chron.* 19. 30, *and* 31. *chapters to* 1 *Kings* 23. *cap.* 20. *v.* where we have the examples of Jehoſaphat, Ezekias and Joſias approved by God; ſee alſo 2 *Kings* 10 *c.* 30. *v.* where even wicked Jehu is comended for killing all the Prieſts & worſhippers of *Baal*.

§. 12. *Arg.* 4. The Prophets of the old Teſtament have foretold that it ſhould be the office of Chriſtian Magiſtrates to Coerce Impoſtores and falſe Prophets with their ſecular power: *ergo*, Chriſtian Magiſtrates are to do the ſame now. The Sequel is evident; and for confirmation of the antecedent ſee *Deut.* 18. c. 18 and 20. v. where the falſe Prophets are adjudged unto death even they which ſhall ariſe in the days of that great Prophet, who is to be heard in all things and is by *St. Peter* (*Acts* 3. 22.) interpreted to be *Chriſt*. ſee alſo an other luculent Propheſie *Zech.* 13. *c.* 1, 2. &c. 1. where theſe things are to be diligently conſidered 1. that the Prophet ſpeaks concerning theſe laſt times under the Goſpel; for he ſpeaks of that day, wherein *a fountain is to be opened to the houſe of David*, &c. that is to ſay, when the remiſſion of ſins through the blood of Chriſt ſhall be clearly preached not only to the houſe of David properly ſo called, but to the Church, which conſiſts both of Jews and Gentiles, and is ſignified uſually in Scripture by the houſe of David, the houſe of Jacob, &c. 2. this puniſhment that is to be inflicted on falſe Prophets is corporal; for it is ſaid, *they ſhall not live, they ſhall be thruſt thorow, and they ſhal bear wounds in their hands*, 3. this puniſhment is to be inflicted becauſe they have *ſpoken lies in the name of the Lord. v.* 3. 4. its not all the falſe Prophets that are to be put to death, but only the moſt pertinacious and incorrigible; for ſome will be aſhamed of their viſions, and lay aſide their *rough Garments wherewith they uſed to deceive*, when they are *wounded in their hands*, and have other medicinal puniſhments like that inflicted upon

on them, and lastly its to be marked, that the zeal of those times is to be so great, that neither the natural nor politick Parents may spare these false prophets, not that their natural parents are to destroy them with their own hands at their own pleasure (for the sentence of the judge is required thereto, *Deut.* 17. 5. *and* 6.) but they are to discover them and act against them legally before the judge, and to kill them according to *Deut.* 17. 6. 7. &c. But we come to the

Section VIII.

Wherein the tendency of Quakerism to Anarchie and confusion of state and treason is discovered, as also the Quakers denying the necessity of Christianity manifested, and R. Barclais new offer of dispute discussed.

§. 1. TO prove that Quakerism leads to Anarchy and confusion of state and treason is a work which now needs very little pains: for as the foresaid dispute fully proves they contend for a third dispensation, under which evil is to be resisted only with a spiritual sword (let our Magistrates judge if these men would pull them down and in place of them set up their own spiritual Magistrates, if they could, as *John of Leiden* and his turbulent *Anabaptists*, who were likewise *Enthusiasts*, did at *Mnuster in Germany* set up their new dispensations) and moreover the Q. teach also, that it is unlawful for the present Magistrates under our present dispensation called by them legal, to kill thieves, robbers, &c. yea, and deny our Magistrates all power of punishing any evil doers whatsomever, in that they give in these texts (*resist not evil, pluck not up the tares*, &c.) as repeals of the old Laws to punish Idolaters and false Prophets, &c. and call upon us to prove that, the present Magistrates and the temporal sword, and all evil doers, were understood Rom. 13. for they might as solidly produce these texts as repeals of the Laws to punish any evil doers whatsomever and use the same reasons against the punishing of them: So *Quakerism*, as we conceive beyond all doubt tends to *Anarchy, confusion of state, Treason*, &c.

§ 2. In the next place we shall make it appear, that the Q: denyes the necessity of professing Christianity, that is to say, of knowing, believing

lieving and confeſſing the tenets that are peculiar to the Chriſtian Religion, and difference the ſame from all other Religions in the world which we endeavour thus. They who deny the neceſſity of knowing and believing Chriſts Incarnation, outward crucifixion, burial, and reſurrection &c. deny the neceſſity of profeſſing Chriſtianity, or of knowing, believing and avouching the tenets that are peculiar to the Chriſtian Religion. But ſuch are Q: *ergo the* Q: *deny the neceſſity of profeſſing Chriſtianity*, &c. The 2. propoſition is confeſſed by themſelves, and in particular *by R. B. pag.* 19. 20, *and* 21. *of his truth cleared of Calumnies, and pag.* 14. *of his W. M. unmasked.* And the firſt propoſition is as true as the ſecond, for Chriſts incarnation, death and reſurrection, &c. are all the tenets which be peculiar to Chriſtianity. We know the Q. will ſay theſe doctrines are neceſſary to be believed, when they are revealed; But in that they deny the neceſſity of revealing and knowing them, they ſtill deny the neceſſity of profeſſing Chriſtianiſm.

§. 3. But further we prove that Q: deny the neceſſity of the incarnation and outward ſufferings of Chriſt, thus briefly. If the Q: ſet up a new Chriſt in every man that is born and grows up in them unto a perfect ſubſtantial birth (they joining with him) that ſuffers and ſatisfies for them, and ſprinkles their conſciences from dead works, then the Incarnation, death and reſurrection of Chriſt outwardly are not neceſſary; for to what end can they ſerve unto which theſe are not ſufficient however. But the firſt is verified from the Q: own writings cited by us already pag. and in particular Mr. *Keiths immediat Revel.* pag. 7. &c. Mr. *Barclays Calumnies p.* 19. 20, *and* 21. *and his Maſque p.* 14; and therefore the laſt is true alſo: yea, they prefer this inward Chriſt and his tranſactions to the true Chriſt of God, as he will be ſufficiently convinced, who ſeriouſly read theſe places: we ſhall only repeat one of them, and it is *Pennington*, who in his *q*: 25. expoſtulates how the outward blood can cleanſe the Soul from ſin: but may we not fitly apply that Scripture unto them which they have wreſted in the tittle page of their book, *Act.* 4. 27. *for of a truth againſt thy Holy child Jeſus, whom thou haſt anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Iſrael were gathered together.* And now it remains that we convaſſe R. Barclays new provocations.

§. 4. Whereof if any ſhould inquire for the Motives and Inductive reaſons, we have thus to ſay for their ſatisfaction. 1. that R. B. for and in name of the Q· Some moneths ago, moſt vainly and arrogantly like a very *thraſo* emitted in Print *Theologick theſes*, as he terms them, with his own name affixed to them, as if he had been the ſole Author of

the

the same (whereas any that will consider his behaviour in this publick dispute, and compare it with the subtil Sophistrie of the theses, may perceive the hand of G. K, &c. in the work) he provoked all *Europe*, caused translate them, send them abroad, sought dispute in several places from any who would without distinction upon the acompt of this Printed provocation, boasted and gloried that he got no dispute, and what not? *Parturiunt montes.* but when he was putten to the performance of his promises, came very fare short, bewrayed ignorance and folly egregiously; we might add the weakness and unhappiness of his cause, which fell into the hands of such a disputant, and disgraced all his *friends*, in whose name he did go about such things. For at *Elgin* as we are credibly informed, he with G. K. fled and disserted a dispute, that was appointed to be at the crosse betwixt them and R. G. R. Barclais own Uncle; and at *Aberdeine* declyned to dispute with us, (as may be seen in our preface) and, when they had condescended to it at last, to salve their credit before the people, stood wonderfully at the drawing up of the Articles, upon every *punctilio* to shift us off, and, which is worse yet, R. B. was non-pluss'd frequently in the dispute it self, that he asserted *Mediums* between the two parts of a contradiction, caused G. K. answer for him, and in a word behaved himself so, that the most part of the hearers perceived his weakness, &c. and spread abroad the report of the same before the dispute was fully ended. So this *Goliah's* honour was laid in the dust by *stripling*, his ignorance renounced through city and country and he accompted a bold barker but a soft biter; wherefore, to regain his credit, he hath betaken him to railing and new provocations as his last refuge, imitating in this the ordinary practice of *Heretickes*, and in particular these of whom *Athanasius* Tim. 1. against the *Arrians* p. 550. saith, that *his animadversis, certi quam nihil sit fiducia in sua secta ad mendacia de piis hominibus confingenda confugiunt.*

§. 5. This champion (p. 54. of their pamphlet) alledgeth that in this late Rencounter, *it was specially provided that it should be obstract from the challenge given to the preachers, and so no fulfilling of it.* *Answ.* In the Articles we meaned only a pretended publick challenge, &c. or a publick challenge which the Q. said was given to the preachers in general (which is alledged, *Art.* 2.) or to the three who are provoked, *de novo*, (which is insinuated here) given to them, we say, more then to others. For others can dispute with them in the publick places spoken of, in the end of the *English* theses no lesse then these, and all the Doctors professors, and students of Europe *In cumulo* are provoked alike in the begining of the theses; yea they sought dispute upon the accompt of this printed

pro-

provocation from all without distinction and from us in particular, as well as from these Ministers; but this late ingagement is a real fulfilling of it, so that all.

§. 6. But suppose what they alledge, are these Ministers the more concerned to meet and debate with these Q. as R. B. inferrs *ibidem*: *Ans.* it will not follow, especially seing the report of the victory in this late dispute is past upon our side, who are but young men, and cannot do so well as our Ministers; whence it rather follows, that its needless for them to meet and debate again with these men; yea, suppose that we had come short of our attempt (which we leave to be judged by others) and though these Ministers be every way more learned and grave then we, and also the Churches very capacious, yet it will not follow that these our Ministers ought to accept these their vain provocations and challenges.

§. 7. We humbly conceive, we say, that our Ministers ought not to accept of these offers of dispute with these men; for 1. our Ministers and others have often conferred with them at length, and found them obstinate Hereticks betaking themselves to so pitiful shifts, that any rational indifferent person would have upon good grounds judged them to be self-condemned, and wilful shifters of the truth; and therefore our Ministers ought to shun them after two or three admonitions, according to the Apostles command, *Tit.* 3. 10. and not dispute with them: To which joyn, that, whatever should be the event, these men would boast of victory, tear our Ministers good names, speak evil of the truth, &c. and so that dispute should be a mean of stumbling the weak, hardning the fallen and dishonouring God, rather then the contrair; and therefore they should have no such dispute allowed them, according to Christs own command *Mat. 7. 6. give not that which is holy unto dogs.*

§. 8. Christ indeed answered the questions of his opposers; but had he taken sufficient pains upon them, given them two or three admonitions, and found them to be obstinate Heretickes and dogs, who would have trampled upon holy things and turned again and torn himself? Or did he appoint and keep solemne set disputs, either publick or private, with such persons, which is the thing in question betwixt us? Christ also taught his disciples to leave ninety and nine and go seek after the one: But it was such, whom they out of charity might account one of his sheep. He never desired them to go and seek goats, wolves, &c. much less to dispute solemnly with them. To this agrees 1 Tim. 6. v. 5. and 20, v. 2 Tim. 2. 16, 23, 25. and 26 vers. Tit. 3. 9, &c. which we beseech the reader to consider, to this also agrees the practice of S. *John*, who would not abide in the same bath with

the Heretick *Cerinthus*, and likewise of *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna* who declined to meet with the Heretick *Marcion* in the way, who asking of him knowest thou him? replyed, I know thee for the first begotten of Satan, as witnesseth *Eusebius*.

§. 9. An other reason is that all publick dispute of Religion, especially our confession of faith is prohibited by the supream power of this kingdom. But then (saith R. B. 48, 97.) Popery in Italy and Spain and Mahumetism in the Turks dominions are not to be called in question. Answ. this meets not with us, for we speak only of publick dispute, and he pratles of calling in *Question* whatsoever, between which there is a vast difference. For God hath neither commanded or forbidden publick dispute, but left them as things indifferent, which may be commanded or forbidden by Magistrates in their respective dominions: And now the respective Magistrates in *Italy*, *Spain*, *Britain*, &c. have interdicted them, so that none dare, nor ought to seek them to be given by the Clergie without the several Magistrates consent and leave. Yea, even Protestants may not seek, that they should be granted them against Popery in Italy or Spain, nor against Mahumetism in the Turks dominions, *Invito Magistratu*; and the Q: (especially R. B.) in seeking a publick dispute of Religion to be granted them by our Ministers, without the leave and consent of the superior powers, shew themselves *Rebels*, because so they deny obedience presumptuously to, and violat a Law which is made by the supream Magistrate, and doth not in the least clash with any of Gods Laws.

§. 10. In the mean time as these Magistrates have prohibited publick dispute of Religion, so they might have injoyned them with persons, that are not found to be obstinate and hardned; and yet may as they see fit, notwithstanding of the Laws made in the contrare, ordain these disputs, *pro jure & privilegio*, reserved by them, in such cases; yea (which the Papists deny) the civil Magistrats may vilipend the checks and reproofs of Pope, Cardinals, Jesuits, or even of these Quakers (who openly profess pag. 97. to oppose our profession and not Papists) and furthermore they may also punish condignly all such of their own subjects who gain-stand or find faule with these commands. This may be easily applyed to the cases of the *Emperour Charles* the fyfth and his Brother *Ferdinande* and of the *Queen Mother in France*, against whom the Papists most unlawfully exclaimed for allowing publick conferences in their own Dominions; and so R. B. sees no better when it seems to him, that we defend our selves here by Popish weapons, then he saw, when he looked thorow our Arguments in the flegg.

§. 11. But, *ex altera parte*, trying of Religion and calling it in question privatly is commanded by God and practised, both by Christ and his Saints in all ages. So our Ministers are to debate the matters of Religion privatly with them, who have not manifested themselves to be obstinate Hereticks. So we ought to call in question Popery in Italy, Spain, and Mahumetism in Turkie, as occasion offers, Notwithstanding of the unreasonable Laws made against the same by the respective Magistrats, for we ought to obey God rather then man, and yet we should not be guilty of Rebellion; for we should yeild passive obedience, if required, which only is due to the Magistrats, when their commands clash with the commands of God. So our Ministers ought not (as we humbly conceive) to accept these provocations, or dispute with these men, especially publickly. But further we add now that our Ministers, as being over-seers and watch-men of Gods flock, ought (as they likewise do) to speak against these & other obstinate Hereticks as woolves, theefs, &c. both in Pulpit and out of Pulpit, detect and confute the errours really maintained by them, yea and particularly to designe them, whether absent or present, that so the people, knowing them and their errours, may beware of them. This is clear from the Scriptures *Mat.* 16. 6. &c. *Mat.* 23. 13. &c. *Mark* 7. 10. &c. 1 *Tim.* 4. 6. &c. and from the practice of Godly Pastors in all ages.

§. 12. But how can we justifie our selves (may one say) seing we have Disputed with them, and that publickly? To which we *Answ.* 1. That we appointed and intended only a private conference, as may be seen, *Art.* 1. though they without our consent or knowledge made it publick, as may be seen in our Preface; and by so doing, have wilfully and presumptuously broken the Laws of the Kingdom, and deserved the punishment annexed to them. 2. Doth the Apostle in the forecited places, speak to *Timothy* and *Titus*, as Christians (which we are likewise) or as Ministers of the Gospel, which we are not? 3. Had we taken pains on these men before, and found them to be obstinate Hereticks, and ravening Dogs, &c. Or had we given them two or three admonitions? But 4. though we had been overcome (which we leave to be judged by others) or misrepresented (as we indeed are grosly) yet we being but private Young Men, the truth could not incurre great disadvantage, nor any professing the truth, be much stumbled. But on the other hand, if they should have come short (as generally they are reported to have done) they being the great Prophets of their Sect; their cause could not but receive a considerable disadvantage, their proselytes get occasion and reason to doubt of their Doctrines, and seek for the truth, weak Christians might

be confirmed (God concurring by his Grace) and the mouths of these men likewise might have been stoped. But more of this will be found in the Preface, to which we refer the Reader, for his further satisfaction.

Section IX.

Wherein the rest of the Quakers Calumnies and Revilings are canvassed.

§. 1. WE have purposly throughout this Treatise, past by personal Criminations, as much as we could, least the reading of them should have proved nauseating to the more serious; and we do here in this Section speak to them by themselves, leaving to every mans pleasure, to read the same or not, as they judge convenient. In the first place then, we take notice of that *gross lie*, which throughout the whole Book, and in particular, *pag.* 84. they have impudently asserted, to wit, that our profoundly learned and reverend Ministers, *M. John Minzies*, *M. George Meldrum*, and *M. William Mitchel*, have put all this *in our Mouthes*, *which we spake on the Stage*. They think it below them surely, to be overcome by such striplings as we are, and therefore have vented this invention; which is altogether groundless. We might indeed have gotten instruction from our Pastors, both before and since the Dispute, by reading their Writings, hearing their Sermons and publick Lessons, and even by private Conference; especially one of them being our Professor; and these things cannot so much be called their stuff, as the Prophets, Apostles and Fathers, for, *nil dictum, quod non dictum prius*. But, that they hounded us out to this publick Dispute with the Q. or framed so much as one of these Arguments, in order to the same, we faithfully declare to be lies, and any man will be perswaded hereof, who reads in our Preface, how we were surprised the first day in the Q. meeting-house, and drawn forth into publick by them, without the knowledge of our Ministers; and doubtless such a person will marvel how they could so shamefully averre this in Print, seing they and others who were at their meeting, are conscious of that surprisal; yea he may upon good grounds, suspect all their Revelations to be cheats, for there is no way of knowing this, whereto they can pretend, but revelations.

§ 2

§. 2. Like unto this, is another of this pernicious Cabal, set down in their *Contra-remonstrance*, viz. that this is *G. M.* work (wherewith they have been threatned) *under our covert*. To which we say, that we can make it appear by diverse testimonies, that our Papers were drawn up by our selves; and time also will demonstrate, that they are distinct from the said Work of this really learned, holy and vigilant Pastor of Christs flock, *p.* 54. They denominate one of his Colleagues, one *M W. M.* out of disdain, *Catechist at the foot of Die*. But herein they deal exceeding maliciously: for when he officiated at the foresaid place (which was but for a short space, and long before the publishing of their Pamphlet) he was a vigilant Preacher and Instructer of that people, and needs not be ashamed of his labour. And not only so, but they show also their prid in calling him Catechist, out of derision, as if they were all perfect in knowledge, while indeed many of them, although most conceity, yet are very raw, and have need to be instructed in the Catechetical Principles.

§. 3. *Pag.* 53. They Forg a very palpable lie on our admirably learned and reverend Professor, *M. John Meinzies*, to wit, *that he went within a day or two, to desire the Bishop to complain to the Kings Council and Primat of Scotland* upon them &c. he indeed might have done the same very lawfully, for they wilfully transgressed the Laws of the Land, in making the Dispute publick, as said is. But they bewray their rancor and deceitfulness exceedingly, in alledging it; for there was never such a thing, as both of them have sincerely declared. And as for that they say, *they were informed of it*, &c. we appeal them to produce the authors: For usually these damnable Hereticks, spread a false report themselves, and then say that they heard it. But suppose they had heard such a thing, is it fair dealing to have putten it in Print, never inquiring about it, either at Bishop or Professor, whom they have never hitherto found uncivil in the least. If we should follow their footsteps, might we not cast in their teeth many horrid things. But we think it not expedient to stay here and grate upon their sores.

§. 4. As to the rest then, of the scurrilous revilings and malicious calumnies, wherewith *R. B.* hath impudently aspersed our innocent and eminently pious Professor. We judge it likewise superfluous, to insist here in a prolix refutation of them, because they are sufficiently repelled already by himself in the Preface, and Postscript of his renowned Roma mendax, and so an antidot prepared before the poyson came forth: only we say briefly, that *R. B.* and the rest of his friends, (in whose name he Acts so) have hereby as with a

Sun-

Sun-beam, manifestly discovered to the World, that they are of the same spirit of Anti-christ, *viz.* the spiteful Jesuits; for as they borrow from them the most of their damnable Doctrines and abominable practices; so likewise, they have greedily licked up from them these detestable Calumnies, and again, like Vipers spouted them out upon this so eminent a Person; which doubtless with judicious and ingenuous persons will prevail so (even abstracting from all other inducements) as to discredit their whole pamphlet; and as a fresh Argument that they came short in the Dispute, for if they had not therein been pitifully galled, they had never betaken themselves to such desperate courses, and as most judicious persons has observed, it tends not a little to the disadvantage of their Cause: and on the contrary, redounds to the great advantage and honour of the person thus reproached, who as he hath learned how to be abased, and despise their insignificant barkings, so likewise he may rejoyce and be exceeding glade, according to that affectionate injunction, *Mat.* 5. 12. knowing that these phantastical phanaticks revile him for no other motive, but because he is a valiant defender of the truth, a vigilant instructer of others, who may stand for the same also, and a faithful Preacher down of all sin and wickedness, as one said of the Christians in old, that if they had not been good persons, the Emperour *Nero* would never have hated and persecuted them; so we may say of him, that if he were not a great defence and invincible Bulwark of the truth, he would not be the continual butt of the unreasonable malice and envy of these brethren in evil Papists and Q.

§. 5. But not to rake any longer in this stinking puddle of their so unjust Criminations, least it prove loathsome to the Reader, we shall conclude with the Reason, why this small treatise came no sooner abroad; it is not any defect on our part, who, as the Printers with whom we dealt and also several other Gentlemen who were privy to our transactions, can declair, offered them long since to the Press, yea, and within lesse then eight dayes after the Q. published their counterfeit Narration, we offered them to the Printer at *Aberdene*: but the real cause is the many difficulties we have met with at the Press, being forced to Print at a great distance, and for a long time to exchange Letters with our Printers there, before we could bargain with them. However, we have published the Work, now when things are expeded, and leave it to be considered by our Antagonists, wishing the Reader a blessing from the Lord upon his labours.

FINIS.

An Advertisement to the READER.

IF you would know the reason, why we would not meet with the Gu. and draw up a new narration of the *dispute*, which both parties should subscrive, being so much desired by them, as we our selves have declared p. 5. of our *Preface*, it was because neither we nor others besids us could expect anie good issue of such a meeting with them, whom we had found before so much wedded to their own interests.

It is to be marked also, that when we answere the Gu. *objection* of our speaking two or three at once, and the speaking of others, who were not concerned p. 6. 7. we deny not but sometimes all of us justified what one said, as for instance, *That the Syllogism questioned so much by* G. K. *in the first argument, was formall*; neither do we refuse but sometimes there was great noise and tumult among the people, farr less, that *Al. Skeno* intruded himself into the *Dispute* in the Gu. behalf. Only we say, that we did not all three set upon them together, nor any unconcerned in the *Dispute* intrude himself into it to propound any *Argument* or *Medium*, which is all at most, that we should be obliedged to answere for. Whereas *pag.* 19. *col.* 2. *lin.* 5. we say, that the word (*such*) was onely *in the former Syllogism*: we are to be understood of the first parts of these *Syllogisms*, as being that to which the answere was made; for (as may be seen in *our Account*) the word (*such*) was really in the latter parts of both these Argumentations. *Pag.* 4 *cap.* 2. towards the end, we say, *That they had set down three answeres of their's together, without any Reply of ours; and the Auditors can testifie that they are Lyars*, &c. The meaning is not, that our Adversaries spake not one of them after another; yea, we have both in *our Account* and *Annotations* made known, that they spake one of them after another: as for example, when they were explaining the necessitie of their *Revelations* &c. and that they added one to another when they were explaining their answers, and not only so, but likewise interrupted, differed from, and contradicted one another in their answers &c. But the thing intended by us (which also the Auditors can testifie) is, that two of our Adversaries never gave in materiall and distinct answers, the one of them after the other (as they have in that place of *their Account* set down) to which we returned no kinde of Reply, either interveening betwixt these their answers, or following the same. *Pag.* 97. we say, *That the words of Paul* 1. *Cor.* 7. 6. *I speak this by way of permission* &c. *have a reference*

vence to the thing going before [to wit] *that married persons may for a time deny each o-ther due benevolence*, and this, we as yet, judge tollerable; for he did leave the same as a thing indifferent to be determined by themselvs. We subjoin *ibidem*, *That others would be referring the words to every mans having his own wife* &c. where (say they) *Paul* doth not strictly command marriage to all persons whatsoever, but permits it to their own libertie and pleasure. And here we declare, that we dissent from these men, as judging those words in the 2. v. *Let every man have his own wife*, &c. to be a strict command, though not obliedging all men without exception, yet surely injoining the incontinent (to whom they are clearlie restricted) to marry and have their own wives &c. But now we adde that the words of this 6. ver. may most fitlie and are generalie referred to that which is in the 1. ver. *It is good for a man not to touch a woman* which the *Apostle* doth not command, but only permit, (he himself nevertheless being inspired of GOD so to doe) and any judicious person will here assent to us, who considers impartially, how the *Apostle* expresseth that saying of his in the 1. v. and the reasons of the 6 v. which are subjoined immediatly after it.

As for the *Errata*, some of lesser moment, which change neither the sense nor the words (as in most part of books, so in this) are referred to the *Reader* himself, some that were more materiall, we our selves have corrected them in most, if not all the Copies; and the rest we have set down in this *page* to the view of the serious *Reader*, as followeth *Title page, lin.* 12, 13, 14, *Read* together with the examination of the *Qu.* pretended true and faithfull account. *In the Book it self, p.* 7 *column* 1. *l.* 31. after ourselves *supplie*, and therefore *p.* 12. *c.* 2. *l.* 17. after G. Keith *supplie* upon the stage: and *l.* 21 after (that) *supplie* now *p.* 14. *c.* 2. *l.* 24 *read* would they have let it. *p.* 17. *c.* 1, *l.* 25. *r.* we our selves; and *l.* 27 for yet *r.* ye. *p.* 28. *c.* 2. *l.* 20. after omitted *supplie* this. *p.* 39. *c.* 1. *l.* 31. for P. G *r.* I. L. and *l.* 34. after (water) *supplie* [here *G K.* interrupted *I. L.* and desired him to let the young man speak for himself and *P. G.* said] which was in our written papers, as the very printed annotation upon the place doth evidence, and likewise our want of all sort of temptation of adding it, if it had not been in the written papers *p.* 40. *c.* 2. *l.* 30. after (spake) *supplie* not. *p.* 51. *l.* 25. *r.* or if the *Apostle* be *p.* 125. *l.* 35. after given *supplie*, For we could never see any challange given either.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND